

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. 409.—OCTOBER, 1906.

Art. I.—THE NAVAL SITUATION.

1. *The Naval Annual*, 1906. Edited by John Leyland and T. A. Brassey. Portsmouth: Griffin and Co.
2. *Jahrbuch für Deutschlands See-interessen*. Edited by Nauticus. Berlin: Mittler und Sohn.
3. *Taschenbuch der Kriegsflotten*, 1906. Munich: J. F. Lehmann.
4. *Fighting-ships*, 1906-7. Edited by F. T. Jane. London: Sampson Low.

THERE is a growing tendency to regard a gloomy pessimism as a badge of patriotism. The British horizon is always represented as dark with gathering clouds. No matter what happy circumstances may occur—as occur they do—to dispel the distant and hardly discernible storm-portents to the east or west, prophets of misfortune remain unsatisfied and cast round for indications of trouble in other directions. Whatever happens, they never admit that the perils which threaten the British Empire have been dispelled or even lessened. There is always a threatening cloud somewhere, which may burst at any moment and overwhelm us. With this passion for pessimism goes the movement for depreciating all things British. Such a mental attitude is not altogether unhealthy, in so far as it serves as a corrective to the sense of smug satisfaction and indolent content in which lie the seeds of national decay. The British people should be conscious of their heritage and remain ever on watch and ward. But this pessimistic spirit may be cultivated to a point when it becomes a positive disease; and a nervous condition may be created which is calcu-

lated to undermine the self-reliance and sturdy common-sense of the British people.

The British fleet is the favourite target for these insistent prophets of evil. They trade upon the nation's jealous anxiety for its first and indeed only line of defence. Every opportunity is seized with avidity which may serve as an excuse for depreciating the fighting value of the British navy and appreciating the menace which the mere existence of foreign fleets can, by a far-fetched ingenuity, be made to represent. At this moment we are menaced, not by any warlike forces wielded by alien hands, but by the frothy exaggeration of patriotism which battens on the Englishman's ignorance of the intricacies of naval policy and the amazing developments in the instruments of warfare which are always in progress. At a time when the British fleet occupies a position of unchallenged and unchallengeable supremacy, such a campaign would be doomed to failure but for the nation's unfamiliarity with the meaning and real significance of sea-power, its nervous fear lest its only arm of defence should be weakened, and its apparent inability to utilise the experience and memories of the past as guides for the future.

For a decade or so naval events have conspired to favour Great Britain, with the result that to-day, not only actually but relatively to rival Powers, the fleet is stronger than it has ever been. In 1897 there were six great fleets, those of France, Russia, the United States, Italy, Germany, and Japan, each a possible antagonist. In framing the estimates from year to year, the Board of Admiralty had to base their calculations on the ship-building activity of all these Powers; and an eye had to be kept on the not inconsiderable warlike preparations of Spain, because, owing to her contiguity to Gibraltar, it was fully realised that she might prove an accessory to our defeat in case of a serious struggle with, for instance, France and Russia, states which were then not only in close alliance, but were hostile to this country and in command of warlike instruments of such potential strength as to give occasion for justifiable anxiety. In the Far West, where our relations with the United States lacked the cordiality of to-day, we witnessed with unconcealed alarm the growth of the American fleet, on which

money was being spent lavishly; while in the Far East the navy of Japan was increasing in strength, and had already shown in the struggle with China that it was a force which, though small, could not be neglected. The outlook was further complicated by the Italian fleet, which then ranked almost with that of France.

Two simultaneous movements supervened which further changed the naval situation. On the one hand, the dispute between the United States and Spain came to a head; and in the ensuing war the Spanish fleet was completely destroyed. On the other hand, the naval movements in Russia and Germany gathered strength; and with extraordinary determination both nations bent themselves to the task of augmenting their sea squadrons. The significance of the German Naval Act of 1898 was not then apparent. At first sight it appeared to be a comparatively meagre provision for procuring a defensive naval force commensurate to the growing oversea trade and mercantile marine of the German Empire. The special Russian programme was a matter of more immediate moment. The Tsar set aside a special grant of 9,000,000*l.* over and above the ordinary annual provision for the naval service, which was to be devoted exclusively to the construction of men-of-war. This sudden resolve completely upset the calculations of the British Admiralty; and supplementary estimates were at once presented to the House of Commons by Mr (now Viscount) Goschen. This spirited reply to Russian naval aggrandisement assisted in composing the mind of the British public.

The naval outlook, however, from this moment became one of increasing gravity; for, while Spain had disappeared, we had Russia, France, and Germany all engaged in a competition for sea-power which was calculated to undermine the supreme position of the British fleet. Within a couple of years of the dramatic announcement of the Russian special grant, the German Emperor determined to seize the opportunity furnished by the success of the propaganda of his own creation, the German Navy League, to commit the Reichstag to a further remarkable naval programme. Under the Act of 1898 provision had been made for a fleet of nineteen battleships. Now within two years a new measure was introduced and, by various tariff inducements to this party and that, it eventually

passed with only insignificant amendments, doubling the number of armoured ships contemplated in the first enactment. From a fleet merely for the purposes of coast-defence, Germany's aspirations had expanded to a fleet capable of taking the offensive against the greatest naval Power. In the preamble to the Naval Act of 1900 it was recorded :

'Germany must have a fleet of such strength that a war even against the mightiest naval Power would involve such risks as to threaten the supremacy of that Power. For this purpose it is not absolutely necessary that the German Fleet should be as strong as that of the greatest naval Power, because generally a great sea-power will not be in a position to concentrate all its forces against us. But even if it should succeed in meeting us in superior force, the enemy would be so much weakened in overcoming the resistance of a strong German Fleet that, if a victory were gained, the foe's supremacy would not be secured to it by a sufficient fleet for the time being.'

'The mightiest naval Power' was then, as now, Great Britain, which at that time dissipated its force over the world so as to render concentration in the North Sea in a short time practically impossible. The significance of this official declaration was unmistakable.

At this moment German naval activity found its echo in the shipyards of Russia, France, and even of Italy. The naval outlook was calculated to create much anxiety in the British Empire ; and this feeling of uneasiness found appropriate, and indeed necessary, expression in the provision made from year to year in the Admiralty's estimates. With admissions of regret, Viscount Goschen, who, as a former Chancellor of the Exchequer, understood the financial aspects of increased demands for the navy, was compelled to ask Parliament for larger votes. From 1897 our expenditure on the construction of new men-of-war rapidly advanced ; in round figures, it stood at 5,000,000*l.* in 1897 and had risen to 11,600,000*l.* in 1904. In spite of this expansion there were not wanting prophets of misfortune who urged that the provision was inadequate. In these years, the years immediately following upon the abortive disarmament proposals launched by visionaries upon the Peace Conference at the Hague, the race for sea-power was at its height. The British Government of

the day admittedly deplored these 'bloated armaments.' It made no attempt to deter rivals from further enterprise by forcing the pace, as only a rich country can do; it merely replied, as it was bound to do, to the proposals of rivals after they had been definitely adopted.

These were years of most serious anxiety. In northern Europe three Powers were piling up armaments; and indications suggested that they might be employed to the disadvantage of Great Britain. One navy was being built and massed in the Baltic and the North Sea, another in the English Channel and the Mediterranean; and the third was being despatched from the Baltic to the Far East as fast as the ships could be completed and manned. With none of these Powers were our relations cordial; indeed, a stronger phrase might legitimately be used. Moreover, owing to the growth of Russian naval power in China waters, where British commercial interests were and still are paramount, the Admiralty were forced to detach battleships from the European squadrons and send them one after another to Hong Kong, so as to provide a counterpoise to the Russian Port Arthur squadron. Hitherto we had been able to keep all our battle units in European waters; and concentration is strength. But, in view of Russia's action, and in spite of the tension then existing between ourselves and France and Germany, with their growing sea-forces, this policy had to be abandoned. Gradually the fleet available for immediate use in the home seas and the Mediterranean was weakened by the withdrawal of important ships for duty in the Far East. Six battleships and a number of large cruisers represented the minimum which the Admiralty considered compatible with safety in the South Pacific.

It thus happened that, when the present century opened, the naval situation was complex, and strongly suggestive of danger ahead. We occupied a position of complete isolation; and no one could foretell when events in the East or in the West might not embroil us with Russia or France, or both, thus laying us open to the tender consideration of Germany. The attitude of Germany was reflected with faithful exactitude in the 'Hamburger Nachrichten':—

'A wise policy dictates that we should hold aloof from England's conflict with France and Russia, which will not

seek war with us when fighting England in three continents, and should reserve our strength in order to be able to throw it into the scale when things come to be re-arranged. The British no longer believe entirely in the unassailability of the European Island Empire, for, whereas many things have changed elsewhere in the last decade, England's system of defence is still the same as in Wellington's time. . . . In view of the world-wide extent of her interests, she must have more ships on foreign coasts than Russia and France. But the Power or Powers which preponderate where the conflict must be decided, that is in the Channel or the North Sea, will be victorious. But the French Channel Fleet alone is already a match for the English; and its junction with the Russian Baltic Fleet would put an end to England's superiority in the waters in which the conflict must be decided. Add to this that her insular position involves the danger of England being starved out by the enemy, so that she must unconditionally surrender, if a victorious hostile fleet should succeed in cutting off her supplies. England has not ignored this danger, and is therefore working diligently at the task of increasing her navy to such an extent that it will be superior in all circumstances. If she maintains her superiority at sea, her antagonists must try to convert the sea-war as quickly as possible into a land-war, and to seek a decision where all the nerves of the World-Empire meet—that is, in London. . . . The attempt to invade England is still, indeed, a risky, but no longer an impossible enterprise.'

This picture of England's weakness in the then existing situation was regarded with increasing favour in Germany, as it was more fully perceived that the state of feeling between Great Britain and the Dual Alliance seemed to be approaching a crisis, owing, on the one hand, to the British occupation of Egypt and other incidents, and, on the other, to Great Britain's fitful and half-hearted attempts to curb Russian aggression in China. Undoubtedly the naval situation at the beginning of the century was full of possibilities of grave peril; and, though at this time the British fleet was strong, its superiority was not sufficient to allay anxiety.

In subsequent years practically every event which has occurred has favoured the task of British statesmanship. The contest for sea-power is very much less acute to-day than it has been at any time in the past twenty years. As a naval Power, Spain has entirely disappeared; as a

result of the war in the Far East, the Russian fleet has been practically annihilated; owing to want of funds the Italian navy is being starved; and the French fleet itself is feeling the effect of the socialistic movement in the government dockyards. Shipbuilding in France is now carried on in a leisurely fashion.* The six battleships of the 'Patrie' class, which were authorised in 1900, are not yet in commission, though two of them have undergone their trials. Year by year naval construction in France becomes more expensive and more dilatory. The naval organisation is cursed with officialdom at its very fount; and the control of the administration over its workmen is ineffective and lax. It is true that this year the Minister of Marine has been directed to lay down six battleships of great power. It is almost certain that only three of these vessels will be begun immediately; and past experience renders it unlikely that these six vessels will be complete before 1912.† Indeed it will not be surprising if even at that date three of these ships are unready for service.

It has always been the custom in this country to attach a high fighting value to the French navy; but in the past two or three years the French people, after carefully studying German naval methods, have been led to doubt whether the war efficiency of their large navy would prove equal to the striking power of the German fleet, at present of smaller size, which is animated by a spirit of sober devotion and single-eyed thoroughness that has never been excelled in any modern fighting force, and has behind it a definite policy consistently pursued. During the Morocco incident this questioning attitude of the French people towards their own fleet led to the rapid development of the *entente cordiale* between their country and Great Britain. With Russia ploughing a lonely furrow of humiliation, weakened and distraught,

* According to M. Lockroy, a former Minister of Marine, 'of all the European fleets, that of France costs the most. The price of shipbuilding is sometimes one third, sometimes one quarter, more than it is abroad; the expenses of administration, of surveillance, etc., affect the votes more considerably than in other countries. The ships remain on the slip longer before they enter the service, and they take longer to finish their trials' ('Le Temps,' Aug. 28, 1906).

† This has since been officially admitted by the French Minister of Marine

France perceived that in any trouble that might arise she could look for little assistance from the Tsar and his advisers. A feeling of terror ran through France during the critical weeks when the news of warlike movements across the German frontier was being received, and there was every indication that the two countries were on the eve of war. By jettisoning M. Delcassé, and by drawing closer the friendly relations with England, the situation was saved. The crisis served at least to give the French Chamber a shock, and to facilitate the task of M. Thomson, the Minister of Marine, in obtaining authority for the new programme of naval construction.

It is, however, important that the real meaning of the six new French battleships and other war craft should be understood. As was candidly admitted during the debates, France is to-day relying upon the friendship of the British people; and she is no longer building battleships against the British fleet, whose absolute ascendancy afloat is admitted without any feeling of jealousy. France is building simply and solely because it was realised during the Morocco incident that Germany was gradually reaching the position of the second greatest naval Power of Europe; and that, in view of Russia's at least temporary eclipse, it was essential that the Republic should make a struggle to hold her own afloat. This marked rivalry between Germany and France, which may or may not be temporary, does not tend to simplify the naval situation so far as the British navy is concerned, because our strength is based on this particular two-Power standard.

At the same time Italy's fleet has become comparatively weak. Financial stringency has severely checked the development of the Italian naval forces. Commander Osvaldo Paladini, ('Naval Annual,' 1906) has put on record, in almost pathetic terms, some of the salient facts—rather under- than overstated—with reference to the Italian fleet.

'The causes for the temporary naval decadence of Italy, which are now in some measure disappearing, are of two kinds—politico-economical and technical, but, above all, economical. A careful examination of the navy estimates of Italy indicates that, if the nation has spent much, it has spent wisely, but little in a relative sense, since the praiseworthy exertions of a few years lasted too short a time, and the sums

voted diminished or remained stationary while the navy estimates of other countries increased.

'Rising from the revolution, and from a mixture of various elements with diverse traditions, the new naval administration of the kingdom had the merits and defects due to its origin. Among the defects, the most serious were the old bureaucratic organisations and provincial interests, some long-continuing, which did not permit, and still do not permit, the employment of the sums voted for the navy in a way to give the best results. On the other hand, while the first warships built had already absorbed more than 8,000,000*l.*, an immense sum for a poor country, the introduction of high explosives in shells and of quick-firing guns changed in a moment the problem for the naval constructor, virtually condemning all the ships already afloat or in an advanced stage of construction. The exertions made by the young navy were rendered fruitless, and new sacrifices were demanded from the country.

'The navy estimates, which stood at 5,089,878*l.* for 1905-6, have been raised to 5,570,158*l.* for the year 1906-7, and are intended to stand at a figure of about 5,380,000*l.* up to the year 1916-17, the Minister being given power to spend within four years the total increase of 4,980,000*l.* in addition to the ordinary navy estimates for naval construction.'

As an outcome of the economic and other factors which have retarded naval expansion in France and Italy, and as a result of the friendly foreign policy towards Mediterranean Powers which the British Foreign Office has pursued for some years past, the position of the British navy to-day is eminently satisfactory. On the shores of the Mediterranean it is perceived, as probably never before, that the British fleet is no machine of aggression, and that its presence in that sea is a guarantee of peace. In Italy, as in France, all thought of rivalling in strength the naval forces which we possess has been abandoned. In the English Channel, in the Atlantic, and in the Mediterranean, the supreme position of the British fleet is, for the present, as assured as is the ascendancy of its ally Japan in eastern waters.

Let us also not forget one entirely new factor arising out of the war. When Admiral Togo and his fleets scattered or destroyed the naval forces of Russia, he gave to the naval Powers of the world a shock from which they will not easily recover. He demonstrated that ships were

not sea-power. He showed that sea-power is a delicate combination between the instruments of war and those who are trusted to use them. The Japanese successes proved that a high standard of war-training, which can be reached only by persistent and honest efforts during the long quiet days of peace, is the real criterion of sea-power; and that a small navy, inspired by a high sense of duty, and trained to fighting pitch, may prove an easy victor in a contest with a mere collection of impressive modern ships manned by crews possessing all the warlike qualities but lacking the essential refining and sharpening process which must be undertaken day by day and week by week, deliberately and persistently.

If we omit the United States navy, which for many reasons stands apart in that it is isolated from Europe, is the most democratic and the most expensive war-force in the world, and is subject to social and other influences of a unique character, it may be said that there are only two navies—the British and the German—which have attained of late years to a high standard of warlike efficiency. The French navy has been retarded by the frequent changes in the Ministry of Marine—there have been over thirty Ministers since 1870, each with a brand-new naval policy; and the Italian navy is cramped, mainly owing to inadequate appropriations.

For three years past the fighting fitness of the British navy has been stimulated; the Admiralty's watchword is 'the instant readiness of the fleet for war'; and this entails a continuous campaign against every indication of inefficiency. Now and again incidents have occurred in the routine of the squadrons at sea which have met with sharp punishment on the part of the authorities, as much as to say, 'Officers and men afloat, please remember the unfortunate case of Admiral Byng.' Before the late war the Board of Admiralty fully perceived that, if the navy was to progress, it must cast behind it many of its outworn traditions, abandon some of the characteristics of the sailing-days, and recognise that, with the arrival of the steam-engine and the adoption of scientific methods of warfare, a new chapter in naval training had opened.

It was the rulers of the youngest and most energetic navy in Europe who led the way in this movement. Some years ago President Roosevelt perceived that the

Germans, in massing their ships for strategical and tactical manœuvres for the education of the higher officers, and devoting great attention to the naval training of the subordinate officers and men, had set an example which the other Powers would be compelled to imitate. With the arrival of Sir John Fisher at the Admiralty, the revolution in the British navy began. It was so sudden in its initiation, so masterful in its execution, and so dramatic in many respects that conservative influences were at first somewhat shocked. But the revolution was the result of years of thought. The changes were overdue; but nevertheless the timid were alarmed. Squadrons of weak ships on the North American coast, in the Pacific, and in the South Atlantic were disestablished and recalled; certain dockyards, far distant from possible storm-centres, which had been maintained on a war-footing at great expense, were reduced to cadres; the reserves at home—ships and men—were adequately organised, the ships being provided with all the essential members of the crew, from the captain downward, and at each port placed under the orders of a rear-admiral, who was instructed that he was responsible for keeping the vessels efficient, and, in case of war, would have to take them to join the sea-going force to which they were allotted. Old and useless coast-defences were abandoned; the torpedo flotillas were enlarged; and efficient reserves were provided, so as to afford the younger officers of the fleet that early training in command and responsibility which in the past has given the British fleet its character for daring, initiative, and resourcefulness.*

As was illustrated during this summer's manœuvres, every efficient ship in the navy is now kept in warlike condition. During the past summer 319 ships of the sea-going fleets and reserves were mobilised for the grand manœuvres without any undue strain on the naval organisation, and without the appearance of mechanical defects which led to so many 'lame ducks' creeping back into port in former years. At the same time, under the

* There are now over one hundred and fifty torpedo craft in charge of young lieutenants continually in commission either at sea or in reserve (the latter making frequent practice cruises), apart from a considerable number of torpedo-boats and submarines which act as a further training-school for the nerve of the young officers of the Navy.

inspiring influence and mechanical skill of Rear-Admiral Sir Percy Scott, the gunnery instruction of the fleet has been systematised, and now calls forth from officers and men a measure of enthusiasm which, it is feared, in some quarters, may go to extreme lengths. It is argued that the spirit of emulation may lead to artificiality, and that the annual 'gun-layers' competition' and the subsequent 'battle-practice' may approximate too nearly to the state of things which is seen at Bisley. Whatever danger ahead there may be in this respect—and no doubt it will be recognised and checked—the undoubted fact is that the gunnery of the navy has made remarkable progress. Commander Charles N. Robinson * admirably summarises the result of the recent energetic work undertaken by Sir Percy Scott in association with Captain Jellicoe, the director of Naval Ordnance, an officer whose name is little known to the public, but whose quiet, painstaking work has been of inestimable value. Commander Robinson says :

'So far as the gunnery of the fleet is concerned, there has not been for a long time such a remarkable year as 1905. From the returns of battle-practice we may see that the rapidity of fire has been just doubled, and the hits doubled also, which means, in other words, that the fighting efficiency or battle-worthiness of the fleet has been doubled.† Then, too, as Mr Robertson explained to the House of Commons, the guns of the navy have been resighted in accordance with modern practical and scientific notions, while all the necessary appliances and instruments in connexion with battle-firing are now in course of being issued. This means much more than appears on the surface, because at the ranges at which battles are now likely to take place the sighting and range-finding and spotting can no longer be performed without special mechanical implements, in the use of which practice is as necessary as for laying and sighting a gun.'

While there is room for legitimate congratulation at the progress which the British fleet has made and the enthusiasm which has been exhibited by officers of all ranks, and by non-commissioned officers and men in

* 'Naval Annual,' 1906.

† If the rapidity of fire has doubled and the number of hits to rounds fired has also doubled, should not the efficiency of the fleet be regarded as quadrupled ?

reaching the present high standard, those who have been most closely associated with the new naval movement know that there is still much to be done. It would be a foolish and short-sighted policy to imagine that the British fleet is perfect. Such self-complacency is dangerous at a moment when a great naval force is being created at our very doors.

Under the inspiring influence of the Kaiser, who for years past has been a careful student of naval history and marine architecture, and an admirer of the works of Captain Mahan, the German fleet has always had before it the highest standard; and, by methods which have sometimes seemed unduly harsh, the Kaiser has reminded commanding officers and all in authority that he will be satisfied with nothing below the very best. In the German navy they are under no delusions as to the real ingredients of sea-power. Officers and men are trained so as to insure that the last ounce of fighting-weight will be got out of every man-of-war when the day of battle dawns. In the German navy the dominating spirit, it is true, is rather the automaton-like militarism of the army than the naval resourcefulness which still characterises the British fleet. At the same time civilians are apt to attach undue importance to mere nautical qualities, and cling to the idea that fishermen and others who have been accustomed from boyhood to the sea must necessarily make the best fleet-men. They forget the fact that a modern man-of-war is little more than a floating engine, containing hundreds of intricate machines, and that the main duty of officers and men in these days—apart from the work of navigation, which is rather less exacting than it was a quarter of a century ago, and is a special line under special officers—is to keep all these mechanical contrivances in order and learn how to use them to the best advantage. The British taxpayer, in his after-dinner ruminations, may, if he will, continue to plume himself upon the sailor-like qualities of the men of the fleet, but he would be nearer the truth if he understood that the British bluejacket is in process of becoming a first-class mechanic, and that mechanics, with nerves of steel, will be the need of the fleet of the future. It is doubtful whether in the German fleet the same mechanical aptitude has yet been developed. Apart, however, from distinc-

tive differences between the personnels of the British and German fleets, the fact to be borne in mind continually by the British people is that the German navy is to-day a real embodiment of sea-power; that year by year increased attention is being devoted to its war-training; and that in strength of *matériel* it is progressing more rapidly than any other fleet in the world, excepting only that of Great Britain, and more regularly than even the British fleet.

It may be that the German fleet is not being built with the single purpose of challenging British supremacy. With this delicate question Viscount Goschen dealt with rare lucidity in his speech in the House of Lords (July 30, 1906,) when he said:

'If there was an idea that Germany was arming against ourselves, he thought that was a mistake; if it was thought that Germany was arming against France or Russia, or any particular Power, he believed that was also a mistake. Why did Germany push on her naval expansion, while France would be compelled to do the same? Not for aggression, but from a settled policy. She required more territory for her teeming millions. She felt that she must have colonies, that she must expand, as other growing countries must expand—that she must have outlets for her commerce, and that she must have sea-power like us to hold her own against every possible effort to limit her colonial expansion or paralyse her action. Her Ministers might say that they were a peaceful Power. They had no desire for war. But they had an Imperial German policy. Was it likely that anything that would happen at the Hague Conference would arrest what they considered to be their mission—what the Emperor considered to be a mission placed upon himself to expand the German power? Those who thought so were living in a fool's paradise.'

In this connexion, it may be remarked in passing that an interesting commentary on the recent alarmist 'war literature' which has appeared in this country and in Germany is supplied by an anonymous article, 'from a naval source,' which has appeared in the '*Schlesische Volkszeitung*' (July 15, 1906), and undoubtedly represents responsible naval opinion in Germany.

'For the last three years books depicting the war of the future have sprung up like mushrooms. In the last few days a new production has appeared. All these works deal

with naval engagements of the German fleet, which takes the offensive and generally gives battle near Heligoland. Also there are certain circles where it is urged that our fleet should take the offensive in the open sea. These views can do much harm and cause untold mischief. The German does not like the defensive; but in a future war our fleet cannot do better than to confine itself to the defensive, if it does not wish to experience another Tsushima and disappear.

'The German fleet, which will most probably have to fight those of England and France, must look on it as its first duty to block the Baltic securely. Its strength is sufficient for this; and we have there a natural harbour than which a better could not be even desired. The second duty is the blocking of the Kiel Canal to enemies' ships; the third, the defence of the mouths of the Elbe and the Weser. Further than this we can do nothing, with the exception of harassing the enemy on the open sea.

'If the closing of the Baltic is omitted, the enemy will press in to Kiel, in which case the German battle-fleet is as good as lost—at any rate, rendered helpless in Kiel. If the German fleet retains the defensive it cannot protect the coasts in the North Sea; but, if the enemy should bombard the open coast-towns, he dare hardly manœuvre in the Watten Meer,* especially when the sea-marks have been removed. Should he do so, it would be throwing away ammunition and would also reduce the accuracy of his guns; which might subsequently give the German fleet a favourable chance to venture on a battle. On these grounds all the sea-battles of modern war literature are improbable. If the fleet is lost it is irreparable. Army corps can be replaced in a week; ships cannot. Therefore our ship material must be economically used in a future war, and not all staked on one chance.

'Therefore, only the defensive. The offensive at the outset would be simply to murder our bluejackets without any compensating benefit; and one does not fight for murder, but to gain the advantage. Numerical advantage over the French and English fleets we can never get, and, moreover, never hope to get, alone.'

Every fleet is an expression of national policy; and, whatever may be the real aims which have prompted the Reichstag to an expenditure of upwards of 110,000,000*l.* upon the construction of new ships and the creation of

* These are the 'flats' off the North Sea coast of Germany, which are so admirably described in 'The Riddle of the Sands.'

an adequate naval organisation, it will be accepted that, in face of the naval aggrandisement of Germany, the British people are compelled to spare no effort to maintain their fleet in a position of invincibility. From the passing of the Naval Defence Act down to the defeat of Admiral Rozhdjestvensky's fleet in the Sea of Japan, the Admiralty, Parliament, and the nation stood by a two-Power standard, which was calculated from year to year on the appropriations for the Russian and French fleets. The Russian fleet has been annihilated; and the true inwardness of its defeat—the lack of training—has been generally perceived, thus discounting all immediate efforts towards its regeneration by mere shipbuilding. Consequently the basis of calculation for the two-Power standard, which has always been held to apply to the two fleets most nearly approaching in strength to that of Great Britain, has shifted from France and Russia to France and Germany. The Prime Minister regards this standard as 'a preposterous idea.' The nation will be running a grave danger if it supports this view. The two-Power standard is, it is true, a rough and ready method of assessing naval strength; but no better one has ever been suggested. It has the advantage of being one which the merest novice in naval affairs can understand. The two-Power standard is the sheet-anchor of British naval supremacy; and, however preposterous the idea of France and Germany uniting in war against Great Britain may seem to the Prime Minister, we shall be courting disaster to these isles, to our colonies, and to our oversea trade if we permit any statesman to abandon or even to whittle away this familiar and well-established formula.

Lord Selborne, when he was at the Admiralty, always insisted that we needed the two-Power standard, 'with a margin over' for contingencies; and the success with which Vice-Admiral Sir William May in last summer's manoeuvres eluded Sir Arthur Wilson's far larger fleet and managed to get command of the Channel, if only for a few hours, revealed the unwisdom of calculating the two-Power standard in too parsimonious a spirit. Owing to the demands of Empire, Great Britain is compelled to maintain in distant seas a considerable fighting force. Our colonial and commercial interests demand local pro-

tection in the Persian Gulf, in China Seas, in the waters which wash the Australian continent, and at the Cape; while at this moment the Admiralty consider it necessary to maintain eight battleships in the Mediterranean and a similar number, based on Gibraltar, to serve as a 'pivot force, available either for use in the Mediterranean or to reinforce, after some delay, the thirteen battleships under Admiral Sir Arthur Wilson, to whom is entrusted the guardianship of the British Channel and the North Sea. Whatever may be the future of our relations with the German Empire, a force superior to the whole German fleet, massed as it will be in the Baltic and North Sea, must be maintained within striking distance. Unless the British people are prepared to evacuate the Mediterranean, and thus abandon an old and well-tried policy, they must be prepared to afford this counterpoise to Germany by building additional ships so as to ensure that there shall always be the requisite number of men-of-war immediately available for use on the east coast of England.

It would be madness to base our policy of defence by our one and only bulwark against aggression upon the transient fact that we happen just now to be on friendly terms with France, and that France and Germany happen to be still bitter enemies. Friendships are subject to sudden alternations of popular feeling. The events of a month may sweep away the *entente cordiale*, and may cement a friendship between France and Germany; but it takes years to build and train a fleet. Men-of-war with trained crews cannot be improvised to meet a sudden emergency. They must be persistently provided year by year, if we would have them ready when the hour of our fate strikes. If the Prime Minister persists in his belief that an alliance between France and Germany is 'a preposterous idea'—France, Germany, and Russia, it may be remembered, combined to coerce Japan in 1895, while England stood by displeased, but powerless—those who have at heart the well-being of the fleet would be quite prepared, for the purposes of calculation, to adopt Germany and the United States as the two Powers embraced within the standard. If this alternative, however, is accepted, the provision for British naval expenditure would have to be further increased, because the American

people are now rapidly overtaking France in the race for sea-power. It has always been the custom of the British authorities to regard the mere possibility of war between the two branches of the Anglo-Saxon race as an outrage upon the better feelings of the British and American peoples. But, if the Prime Minister persists in his theory, he will force the advocates of an adequate fleet into the unfortunate position of emphasising the points of possible conflict between this country and the United States, and will thus be doing the greatest possible disservice to the cause of peace which he protests he has so closely at heart. International peace is never promoted by British weakness.

Fortunately the British fleet at present is at least well up to the two-Power standard, whether that standard is based upon France and Germany, or Germany and the United States, or France and the United States. During Russia's period of naval aggrandisement, prior to the outbreak of war in the Pacific, we met every Russian ship by a superior British unit; and, when almost the whole Russian fleet was wiped out of existence, we retained these equivalent vessels and are reaping the advantage. On this vexed question of our relative strength there is complete unanimity among all qualified authorities. Though various bases of calculation are adopted in the 'Naval Annual,' in 'Fighting-ships,' in the 'Taschenbuch der Kriegsflootten,' and in the 'Naval Yearbook,' edited by 'Nauticus,' the results at which the compilers all arrive are similar. As the latest of these works to be published is the German Yearbook, we cannot do better than accept its evidence as to relative strengths. The table on the following page gives a summary of the *matériel*, (a) built and (b) building, possessed by the various great naval Powers at the end of May last, as set forth by the German statistician.

The pessimist intent on disparaging the strength of the British fleet may take what combination of Powers his fancy dictates, and he will see that, including ships built and building, Great Britain maintains the two-Power standard. This method of calculation is of course very detrimental to Great Britain's position, for two reasons. In the first place, we have adopted the policy of the scrap-heap, and have struck out of the Navy List about 150

—	Battleships : armoured ships of over 5000 tons.	Armoured Cruisers.	Protected Cruisers.	Torpedo craft of over		Sub- marines.
				200 tons.	80 tons.	
Germany	(a) No. Displacement 19 of 213,181 in tons.	(a) No. Displacement 6 of 56,621 in tons.	(a) No. Displacement 25 of 93,390 in tons.	54	74	..
	(b) 8 of 115,450	(b) 3 of 38,200	(b) 7 of 24,150	17
Great Britain	(a) 56 of 775,024	(a) 28 of 323,690	(a) 77 of 430,246	163	37	26
	(b) 10 of 174,811	(b) 10 of 146,820	..	32	..	26
France	(a) 26 of 261,891	(a) 19 of 159,458	(a) 28 of 110,161	45	223	40
	(b) 12 of 197,210	(b) 5 of 66,764	..	28	46	49
Italy	(a) 11 of 137,005	(a) 6 of 39,633	(a) 10 of 25,316	36	90	2
	(b) 4 of 50,496	(b) 5 of 45,332	..	20	1	4
Japan	(a) 13 of 172,324	(a) 9 of 82,118	(a) 14 of 57,225	44	53	7
	(b) 4 of 77,600	(b) 5 of 71,740	(b) 4 of 13,000	10	..	12
Austria-Hungary	(a) 8 of 62,930	(a) 3 of 18,810	(a) 5 of 15,110	8	31	..
	(b) 1 of 10,630	11	23	..
Russia	(a) 11 of 126,114	(a) 3 of 34,107	(a) 10 of 59,076	80	74	22
	(b) 4 of 59,666	(b) 4 of 39,113	..	24	..	8
United States	(a) 18 of 214,028	(a) 9 of 112,612	(a) 17 of 71,328	22	23	8
	(b) 12 of 191,091	(b) 6 of 76,974	(b) 3 of 11,430	3	..	6

In addition Germany has eight coast-defence ships (old) with an average displacement of 4100 tons, Japan two (also old) of 4600 tons, and the United States seven (also old) of 3800 tons each; all these vessels are practically of no fighting value. The same remark applies to a few armoured gunboats possessed by France, Austria-Hungary, Russia, and the United States.

The figures for the Russian fleet include the ships in the Black Sea—still *a mare clausum*. Apart from these vessels Russia has, built and building, only five battleships of 70,298 tons, seven armoured cruisers of 73,220 tons, ten protected cruisers of 59,076 tons, one hundred torpedo craft (fifty-two of under 200 tons), and seventeen submarines.

Practically all the Powers have ceased to build protected cruisers—that is, vessels without armoured belts and protected only by a steel deck—though Germany and Japan have not yet quite abandoned such craft of the smallest size.

ships which, from age or other causes, were held to be of little or no fighting value. No other nation has carried out such an energetic stocktaking policy, with the result that their totals in all classes stand at exaggerated figures. Secondly, British ships are built far more rapidly than those of any nation except Germany. Among the French battleships shown to be building, for instance, are six vessels which were authorised in 1900 and are not yet

complete, and six vessels which have just been authorised, but of which not one has been begun. In Italy, in the United States, and in Russia the rate of shipbuilding is also far slower than in England. In the first-named country the battleships 'Reina Elena' and 'Vittorio Emanuele III,' which were laid down in 1901, are still unready for service; in the United States the battleships 'Georgia' and 'Nebraska,' begun in April and July 1902, are still recorded as 'building'; and in Russia the four battleships under construction comprise the 'Imperator Pavel I,' the 'Andrei Pervozvannyi' (building at St Petersburg), and the 'Evstafi' and 'Ivan Zlatoust' (building in the Black Sea), which were laid down in 1903, and will figure in the 'building' list next year and possibly also in 1908.

On the other hand, we build the largest battleships in three years without any effort; and the Admiralty has announced that in future only two years will be allowed for the construction of even the largest battleships of the 'Dreadnought' and 'Invincible' types; while, under special conditions, the name-ship of the 'Dreadnought' class has been well and truly built at Portsmouth dockyard in a little over a year—thus establishing a shipbuilding record which no other country can rival. The advantages of expeditious construction are manifold. British ships, representing the last word in naval architecture, armour manufacture and gun-making, are at sea ready for war-service, while contemporary foreign vessels are still incomplete. Consequently the ships in the sea-going squadrons of the British fleet are always more modern, and therefore presumably more battle-worthy than those they would have to meet. This is specially true to-day because in Capt. H. S. Jackson, F.R.S., Controller of the Navy, a naval officer of wide experience who is also a scientist, and in Sir Philip Watts, the Director of Naval Construction, who, while at Elswick yard, designed and built many of the ships with which the Japanese did their deadliest work in the late war, the nation has two of the best brains in the country at its service. In naval construction we now lead the world, even more conspicuously than in the last years of the nineteenth century, when Sir William White was at the head of the construction department, and the present Admiral of the Fleet Sir

John Fisher, and Admirals Sir Arthur Wilson, Sir Arthur Moore, and Sir William H. May, were successively in the responsible position now filled by Captain Jackson. Apart from the fact that rapid shipbuilding feeds the fighting fleets with the best and latest ships, thus putting the capital invested to immediate use in insuring the Empire against aggression, it is also economical. Consequently, for this and other reasons, we build our ships more cheaply than any other nation, the advantage over France being about 25 per cent. and over the United States quite as great.

For the present the position of the British fleet is amply secured. The ships now building will form the first line of battle in 1910, and the older vessels will rank after them. According to the compilers of the 'Taschenbuch der Kriegsflootten,' on the one hand, and the 'Naval Annual' on the other, the positions of the great fleets in battleships in 1910 will be as follows:—

ESTIMATES OF STRENGTH IN 1910.

	'Taschenbuch.'	'Naval Annual.'
Great Britain . . .	56 of 815,500 tons . . .	55
Germany . . .	24 of 287,000 „ . . .	26
France . . .	26 of 299,000 „ . . .	20
Russia . . .	15 of 185,600 „ . . .	8
Italy . . .	11 of 137,800 „ . . .	8
United States . . .	23 of 381,500 „ . . .	25
Japan . . .	12 of 168,500 „ . . .	12

It is the policy of the German naval text-books to exaggerate somewhat the strength of foreign fleets so as to encourage the peoples of the German Empire to further efforts to increase the German fleet; and this little weakness accounts for the more flattering estimates of the 'Taschenbuch' in comparison with the 'Naval Annual.' From the British standpoint, the outlook, whichever estimate is adopted, while giving no occasion for alarm, justifies a word of caution. None of these rough-and-ready contrasts can be accepted without qualification. British sea-power is world-wide in its distribution, for the simple reason that the Empire is world-wide, and our trade is world-wide. It is true that the seas are all one, and that in these days of steam-mobility they unite and do not divide. But, in spite of the advantages which the development of the steam-engine has conferred on the

British Empire, it is held to be still necessary to afford local protection to British interests in distant parts of the world. While it is an axiom that trade follows the flag, it is no less a fact that the flag must follow trade. This the Germans, of all nations, most fully recognise. We cannot disestablish the squadrons which are ever on duty in the Persian Gulf, the Indian Ocean, the China Seas, and the Pacific; and we must have adequate forces in the Mediterranean and at the Cape, which protect our alternative routes to the Indian Empire and to our customers in the Far East and under the Southern Cross.

This problem of British defence, as it is governed by the strategy of Empire, will be forced into prominence as the German fleet develops. As ship after ship of the largest and most powerful types is completed, it will join the massed sea-squadrons of the German Empire in the North Sea or the Baltic. If we are content with a bare two-Power standard, calculated by the aggregate of units or displacement or cost, we shall not have an adequate fleet always readily available for duty in the North Sea and the English Channel, owing to the necessities of the Empire in distant seas, where our sea-frontiers run parallel with those of Russia, China, and the United States. We cannot aim at solitary supremacy; we must abandon this rôle which we have supported for so many years in the Pacific. We have acknowledged this fact; and in the new circumstances we have taken refuge in the treaty with Japan, which assures to the two Powers a supremacy in the Far East as complete as our present invincibility in the Far West. But Japan has no part or lot in any trouble which may develop in European waters. Her co-operation is strictly confined to the Far East; and from Singapore to Rosyth we must bear our heavy and unwieldy burden of Empire absolutely unassisted. Our isolation is really no less than it was, for the *entente cordiale* with France and the better relations which we enjoy with Russia may, after all, be no more lasting, if the Dual Alliance is resuscitated as a dominating factor in world-politics, than was the enthusiasm of 1855 when the French Emperor came to our shores, bearing with him the hearts of his French subjects, and Queen Victoria and the Prince Consort visited Paris.

The permanence of the *entente cordiale* depends in the

main on the course of events in Russia. If Russia rises triumphant from the ashes of her Far-Eastern enterprises as a great military and naval Power with fresh dreams of Empire, then, *unless in the interval we come to terms with Russia*, either the Dual Alliance—in which Frenchmen have invested their surplus wealth for many years past—must go, or the cordial relations between Great Britain and France will give place to a less friendly attitude. The main lesson to be drawn from history is that the maintenance of the Pax Britannica depends, not on our Far-Eastern ally, nor on the passing friendships of the hour, which may be severed by a wave of popular feeling arising out of some insignificant incident, but on the superiority of the British fleet to any possible combination. The fleet is our one and only bulwark.

It is for this very reason that the growth of the German fleet is calculated to occasion increasing anxiety. The votes for the maintenance of British naval power depend from year to year upon the Government of the day. There is no continuity of shipbuilding policy, except so far as a strong Board of Admiralty stands guardian of interests which are above party. In Germany, on the other hand, the expansion of the fleet is independent of Treasury pressure and popular opinion. It is described by German writers as a 'programmatical' growth. Under successive naval Acts it goes forward with irresistible momentum; and, as it proceeds, it creates public opinion in its support. This is a significant fact. The vast programme of the present year has been reached in stages. A little step was taken in 1898, a greater one in 1900, and an even greater one in 1906. Can it be said that this last enactment, nominally fixing the rate of growth and the annual expenditure down to 1917, is the final one even within this period? There is no such assurance. An agitation for further naval expansion is already in progress throughout the length and breadth of the German states, where the propaganda of the Navy League is more active than ever; and women and children are co-operating, so great is the naval enthusiasm, to collect money to provide additional men-of-war. We may discount the naval preparations of France and Italy and the United States for various reasons which have been already enumerated, and we may make the most of our alliance with

Japan; but, whatever may be the actual policy, defensive or aggressive, which lies behind the German fleet, we shall ignore this great war-force at our peril. Even if no measures are taken to increase the rate of shipbuilding in the German yards, its programme of shipbuilding and its progressive increase of expenditure, as provided in the latest Navy Act, are sufficiently impressive when it is borne in mind that in 1896—ten years ago only—the total outlay on the fleet was 4,312,995*l*.

NEW SHIPS TO BE LAID DOWN.

—	Battleships.	Armoured Cruisers.	Small Cruisers.	Torpedo-boat Divisions (6 to a Division).	Total sum to be spent on the Fleet.
					£
1906	2	1	2	2	12,336,000
1907	2	1	2	2	13,496,000
1908	2	1	2	2	14,000,000
1909	2	1	2	2	15,030,000
1910	2	1	2	2	15,423,000
1911	1	2	2	2	15,667,000
1912	1	2	2	2	15,931,000
1913	1	1	2	2	16,024,000
1914	1	1	2	2	15,800,000
1915	1	1	2	2	15,838,000
1916	1	1	2	2	15,987,000
1917	2	—	2	2	16,132,000
Total . .	18	13	24	24	—

This is a menacing programme; and German writers are pleading for a further extension. Each of these eighteen battleships to be built will be as big and powerful as the 'Dreadnought,' and will cost 1,875,000*l*.—611,000*l*. more than any German vessel hitherto designed—while the thirteen armoured cruisers will represent an outlay of 1,375,000*l*. each, or 416,500*l*. more than any existing German vessel of this type.

The present naval situation is incontestably favourable to Great Britain; but, in the satisfaction which may be legitimately gained from this fact, it would be the height of unwisdom to omit to take note of the one fleet which most seriously threatens our position in the future. Germany has a right to a fleet as strong as she can make it, because she has great commercial interests and far-reaching Imperial ambitions. We have no legitimate cause of quarrel with Germany on this account. Our

sole duty is to stand on guard and protect our sea-frontiers with as much forethought and care as European Powers employ in protecting their land-frontiers. There is no reason why these ordinary precautionary measures should lead to bitterness. We have Prince Von Bülow's repeated assurances—which we may take for what they are worth—that peace with Great Britain is desired, and that no intention is entertained calculated to lead to war. 'Nauticus' expresses the same views. He admits that the recent interchange of visits must be regarded 'more in the sphere of private than official initiative,' and he adds:

'If the official relations leave nothing to be wished for, it must still not be overlooked that, among the English people, a deep-seated movement against Germany had taken place, fostered by one part of the press, through overcoloured pictures of the threatening danger of a German invasion and of the growth of the German fleet. The presumption lies on the surface that the attempt to represent the political situation as highly critical, and thereby to hinder or postpone the threatened change of cabinets (last autumn), was largely responsible for this. In more recent times men like Sir Thomas Barclay, Lord Avebury, and Lord Lyveden have tried to improve our relations; and the sympathetic reception which the authorities of German towns have recently met with in England bears witness that this movement is gaining ground. It is right to wish and to hope that the full realisation of these hopes may not be denied, and that the two nations, so nearly related, may arrive at a more complete understanding, however far they may have drifted apart, and however much room remains still for the development of their powers in peaceful competition. We hope also that German publicists who, it must in fairness be acknowledged, have on their side not been free from exaggeration, will do their part towards arriving at this goal.'

On both sides of the North Sea the policy of mutual irritation should be abandoned as dangerous and inimical to the welfare of both countries. We have no business with German ambitions except so far as they render precautionary measures on our part essential; and these demand no further action than the maintenance of the two-Power standard. But the retention of this formula, liberally interpreted, is absolutely essential to our safety.

Fortunately the reduction of the naval programme recently announced does not affect this. We are building ships of entirely new types, and it is well not to go too fast. In the next eighteen months we shall lay down six 'Dreadnoughts,' costing ten and a half millions sterling; and this will suffice for the time to give us the margin we must possess. By 1910 we shall have seven 'Dreadnoughts' with seventy 12-inch guns of the latest and most powerful type, in addition to the 'Lord Nelson' and 'Agamemnon,' with eight 12-inch and twenty 9.2-inch weapons, and the eight 'King Edward VII's,' with thirty-two 12-inch and thirty-two 9.2-inch guns, besides 6-inch quick-firers, which are of small account. It may be argued that in gun-fire, if not in defensive qualities, the 'Lord Nelson' and her sister are equal to the 'Dreadnought'; and in any case they will be a fair match for any two of the six new French battleships which are to be completed in 1912. The new 9.2-inch gun carried by these British battleships has a flatter trajectory and a bigger 'danger space' than any 12-inch gun now in use, but of course it has a lighter shell—380 lbs. in comparison with 850 lbs. The 12-inch weapon to be carried in the 'Dreadnought' is the superior gun; but it is quite open to argument that in battle, even at 10,000 yards, the latest 9.2-inch piece is better than the 12-inch gun (mark ix) now borne in the newest British battleships, better even than those of the 'King Edward' class. We have obtained a notable lead in vessels which embody, more or less completely, the main lesson of the Far-Eastern war. In the German and French navies they have only recently awakened to the new and dominant factor in naval war—the prime importance of the big gun. No German battleship built or building carries more than four 11-inch guns, and no French battleship more than four 12-inch pieces. In both navies they have only just realised that the 6.6-inch and 6.4-inch quick-firing weapons respectively are comparatively ineffective at the extreme ranges of the future. While we have seventeen ships, more or less fully representing war's last word upon naval force, France and Germany have not laid down a single vessel of the new type.

The stern struggle for the maintenance of an invincible British fleet has not yet come, but it is assuredly coming,

It is well that we should be forewarned and alert. The nation must understand that the reduction in expenditure on the fleet cannot be continued. In cutting down waste, and by various other means effecting a saving of five millions in our outlay in two years, the Board of Admiralty have done a patriotic act; but hopes that the navy estimates can be kept at about 30,000,000*l.*, at which they will stand next year, are ill-founded. The future depends not on the Government or the Board of Admiralty, but on the efforts of our neighbours. If they build, we must do so also, and up to the two-Power standard, with the necessary margin over. There is no possibility of the Peace Conference having any influence on France or Germany or Russia in the direction of the limitation of armaments; and we must prepare for the grim and costly rivalry in naval power from 1910 onwards which will become inevitable when the deliberations at the Hague have ended in idle words—if no worse.

We all desire peace; but it is a fool's paradise to imagine that this can be obtained by weakening the British Empire's only defensive weapon; and no Government will trifle with this supreme interest without paying the penalty. Happily the day has gone when, without protest, a Government could starve the navy in order to serve the petty and selfish and usually unpatriotic exigencies of party. The British people know what an invincible fleet means to them. This awakening to the inwardness of British naval ascendancy, as a palpable sign of the unity of the Empire, is one of the new facts which all political parties must take into account. The far-flung squadrons are the tentacles of Empire, unseen, but everywhere exerting the traditional influence of the British people. For our own sakes, as well as in the interests of the world's progress, the invincibility of the British fleet must continue to be assured; and politicians, however economically inclined, must learn that this is the bedrock upon which all policy, home, colonial, and foreign must rest.

Art. II.—RECENT ANTARCTIC EXPLORATION.

1. *The Voyage of the 'Discovery.'* By Captain Robert F. Scott, R.N. Two vols. London: Smith, Elder, 1905.
2. *Zum Kontinent des Eisigen Südens.* By Erich von Drygalski. Berlin: Reimer, 1904.
3. *The Scottish National Antarctic Expedition.* By William S. Bruce. Papers in the 'Scottish Geographical Magazine,' 1905 and 1906.
4. *Two Years in the Antarctic.* By Albert B. Armitage, Lieut. R.N.R. London: Arnold, 1905.
5. *The Siege of the South Pole.* By Hugh Robert Mill, D.Sc. London: Alston Rivers, 1905.

WHEN, in October 1901, the subject of the South Pole was last discussed in this Review, two great expeditions had recently left European shores for the prosecution of antarctic research; and two others had just returned from those regions richly laden with new experience and interesting scientific results. Of the home-coming expeditions, the first had been fitted out in Belgium, and was commanded by Captain de Gerlache. The ship was appropriately called the 'Belgica.' Captain de Gerlache's companions were of many nations, but all of them were ardent explorers. The funds available for the expedition amounted to no more than 12,000*l.*, yet the results need not fear comparison with those of expeditions costing many times this amount. To the 'Belgica' belongs the honour of being the first ship to winter within the antarctic circle; and she did so under circumstances of peculiar danger, being frozen in on the open sea far from all shelter of land. In this position the ship remained for over a year, when, with great difficulty, she forced her way out and returned home.

The other expedition was that of Mr Borchgrevink, a Norwegian, who had already visited the antarctic seas on a whaling expedition. He induced Sir George Newnes to fit out a scientific expedition on board a single ship, which landed him and his companions on Cape Adare in the north-east part of Victoria Land. For the first time a winter was spent on the antarctic continent; and the conditions obtaining on the land were ascertained, the meteorological record being of particular interest. This

expedition was planned and carried out in a business-like way. A Norwegian whaler was purchased, fitted, and loaded with huts and everything required by a party landing on a desert and inhospitable coast and proposing to spend the winter there. Notwithstanding the exposed character of the coast where a landing was effected, and the frequent storms which impeded the work, everything had been put on shore, the party installed in their new dwelling, and the ship had started on her return journey in the space of a fortnight. At almost the same date of the next year she returned, took the party on board again, and steamed south, visiting the sheltered inlet of Wood Bay on the way to McMurdo Bay. She coasted the great barrier from Cape Crozier, and not only reached the highest southern latitude which had been reached until then by a ship, but she was able to moor alongside the barrier at a place where it had the height of a wharf or quay, and to land her party for a day's excursion on the ice where they reached the farthest south so far attained, viz. lat. $78^{\circ} 50' S$.

A month before Captain de Gerlache and Mr Borchgrevink returned to Europe, the other two expeditions, to which reference was made above, had set out. One of these was on board the British ship 'Discovery,' Commander R. F. Scott, R.N.; the other on the German ship 'Gauss,' under the direction of Professor Erich von Drygalski. Both these ships were fitted with everything that ample funds could provide. They left Europe in August 1901. It had been arranged that the 'Discovery' should explore the district to which the Ross Sea gives access, lying south of New Zealand; while the 'Gauss' should endeavour to proceed southwards in the neighbourhood of the 90th meridian of east longitude, where the 'Challenger' had crossed the antarctic circle in 1874, and where Wilkes, in 1840, had seen the 'appearance of land,' to which he gave the name of 'Termination Land.'

But these four expeditions, of which two started and two returned in the autumn of 1901, do not exhaust the list. For some years previously Mr W. S. Bruce, who had considerable arctic and antarctic experience, had been endeavouring to fit out a Scottish expedition; but lack of funds stood in the way. In the end this difficulty was removed, mainly by the liberality of Messrs James and

Andrew Coats of Paisley. A Norwegian whaler, the 'Hekla,' was bought, and, under the generous direction of the late Mr G. L. Watson, she was made practically a new ship, which was named the 'Scotia.' The 'Scotia' left Scotland on Nov. 2, 1902, and arrived at Port Stanley, Falkland Islands, after a smart passage of fifty-nine days. She left Port Stanley on Jan. 26, 1903, and spent two months making hydrographical and oceanographical explorations in that part of the antarctic ocean which lies south-west of the Falkland Islands, and bears the name of the Weddell Sea. The rapid approach of winter forced Mr Bruce to seek winter-quarters; and he found them in a bay in one of the South Orkney Islands. Here the ship was frozen in for eight months; and it is a remarkable fact that this happened in so low a latitude as 60°. During the winter a complete series of meteorological observations was taken; hydrographical and geological surveys of the island were made; and large collections of the land and marine fauna brought together. Mr Bruce made good use of the experience he had gathered in the expeditions of the Prince of Monaco, and prepared skeletons of nearly all the animals collected, by the Prince's method of sinking them in pots to the bottom of the sea, and leaving them there until the minute crustaceans had cleaned the bones of everything edible. Owing to this division of labour, the collection of skeletons brought home by the Scottish expedition is one of its most remarkable features.

On Nov. 25, 1903, the 'Scotia' was set free by the breaking up of the ice. Unfortunately it was necessary for Mr Bruce to get into telegraphic communication with Scotland to obtain the credit necessary to refit and supply his ship for a second season. To do this he had to go to Buenos Ayres, which occasioned a serious loss of valuable time. But there was some compensation. Through the friendly co-operation of Mr Davis, the head of the astronomical and meteorological department of the Argentine Republic, the Government of that country was induced to interest itself in the expedition, and, besides contributing most generously to the material necessities of the 'Scotia,' it appointed three observers to return to the South Orkneys with Mr Bruce and continue the meteorological work which had been carried on under the immediate

direction of the well-known Scottish meteorologist, Mr Mossman. When the 'Scotia' returned to the South Orkneys, Mr Mossman agreed to remain there for another winter in order to organise the meteorological service of these interesting regions. This was the beginning of what promises to be the most important network of meteorological stations in the southern hemisphere.

But much valuable time had been lost; and the exploratory part of the work of the 'Scotia' began no earlier in 1904 than it had in 1903. Nevertheless the season proved to be so open in the Weddell Sea that a large amount of useful hydrographical and oceanographical work was done; and the party were enabled to discover and delineate a portion of the antarctic continent, which was appropriately named Coats' Land. Here the 'Scotia' was beset in the ice for a week. Fortunately she freed herself, and Mr Bruce started for the north, making a very important series of observations along a meridian to Gough Island, an outlying member of the Tristan d'Acunha group. He surveyed the island itself and then went home by the Cape of Good Hope. As it will be some time before the results of this expedition are in the hands of the public, further discussion of them would be premature.

Two other expeditions visited the antarctic regions south of South America at or about the same time as that of the 'Scotia.' One was from Sweden, under the direction of Dr Otto Nordenskjöld, and the other from France, under Dr Jean Charcot. Both these expeditions made important additions to our knowledge of the natural history as well as of the physical and meteorological conditions of these regions; but it is impossible here to do more than mention them. The rest of our article must be devoted to the doings of the 'Gauss' and the 'Discovery.'

The German expedition was projected as a private venture, but early in 1899 it was taken over by the Government. The ship was built in the naval yard at Kiel, and was named after the great mathematician Gauss. The expedition was under the command of Prof. Erich von Drygalski. The 'Gauss' left Kiel on Aug. 11, 1901, coaled at St Vincent, and arrived at the Cape on Nov. 23. On Dec. 7 she left the Cape, and, after calling at the Crozet Islands, and spending some time at

Kerguelen, she left that island on Jan. 31, 1902. The course was first laid for Heard Island, which lies about 250 miles south-east of Kerguelen. The settlement of sealers which was there when the 'Challenger' visited the island in 1874 had disappeared; and the sea-elephants which they displaced had reoccupied the beach.

The first object after leaving Heard Island was to search for Wilkes' Termination Land. In February 1874 the 'Challenger' had looked for it without success. It may be of use to quote what is said about it in the report of that expedition (Narrative, i, 405, 407).

'On the 25th [February], at 3 A.M., the wind having moderated to force 5, and the weather being fairly clear, sail was made towards Termination Land. As the vessel proceeded towards the pack, the berg was passed which had been fouled early on the previous day, the score on its surface made by the jibboom remaining well-defined, notwithstanding the heavy fall of snow. . . . After getting clear of the pack at 11 A.M., the ship sailed along its edge until noon, being from 10 A.M. until that time within about fifteen miles of the supposed position of Wilkes' Termination Land; but neither from the deck nor mast-head could any indication of it be seen. The limit of vision as logged was twelve miles; and, had there been land sufficiently lofty for Wilkes to have seen it at a distance of sixty miles (which was the distance that he supposed himself off it), either the clouds capping it or the land itself must have been seen. If Wilkes' distance was over-estimated, that of the "Challenger" would be increased, and it may still be found; but, as the expression in Wilkes' journal is, "appearance of land was seen to the south-west, and its trending seemed to be to the northward," and not that land was actually sighted and a bearing obtained, it is probable that Termination Land does not exist. Still it is curious that pack-ice and a large number of bergs should have been found in nearly the same position as by Wilkes in 1840; and this would seem to indicate that land cannot be very far distant.'

This expectation was realised by the 'Gauss.' Having failed to find Termination Land in its reputed position, she steered west and then south through pack-ice carrying soundings of 1500 to 2000 fathoms. On the morning of Feb. 19 shelter from the wind and snow was sought under the lee of a large iceberg; and here a sounding was taken when a depth of only 130 fathoms was found. The

remainder of the day was spent in the endeavour to drive the ship southward through the pack-ice and against the wind. Towards evening a swell from the southward was met which gave hopes of open water; and these were fulfilled. The ice rapidly opened out, and Feb. 20 was spent cruising in a sea free from ice. The depth of the water had increased to 350 fathoms. The south-easterly wind, which blew with great violence, prevented much way being made. On the morning of the 21st the weather had improved and land was sighted. The photographs show a perfectly open sea with the land uniformly covered with ice. No bare land of any kind was visible. Everywhere the inland ice ended in a cliff which rose some 150 feet above the sea.

The reader will find it difficult to understand why Drygalski, when he had discovered new land with open sea in front of it, did not devote himself to exploring it in preference to any other work. It was legitimate geographical work, which would have afforded an opportunity for himself and his companions to refresh and recruit. During the fine weather of the early part of the day the 'Gauss' could have steamed well up to windward, and might have found shelter under the lee of the land. Even if the land had proved unapproachable, the oceanographical and biological survey of the sea would have afforded profitable employment for several days under shelter. In order however to obtain magnetical observations, the ship ran some four or five miles to the north-west; then dredging was done, while the ship drifted farther out towards the pack-ice, and an easterly wind arose and rapidly freshened. The ship ran before it—she probably could not have made head against it—into the pack-ice through an opening between two edges. 'I confess,' says Drygalski, 'that in passing between those edges I experienced serious misgivings.' Still, a north-westerly course was in the direction of the open water, and he could naturally expect that with luck he would work through. In the night he tried to put back to the open water off the newly-discovered land, but the ship could make no way against the storm. It mattered not how her head might lie, she drifted with the ice. This went on hour after hour. About four o'clock in the morning the motion both of the ship and of the surround-

ing ice diminished, and in a short time everything stood still. The open water was not more than a mile distant from the ship; and it was naturally hoped that she would get free. But the 'Gauss' had gone into winter-quarters, and she remained fast for a whole year, with open water almost always in sight from the mast-head.

This long period of confinement was spent in fairly comfortable circumstances. The 'Gauss' was ice-bound some fifty miles from the edge of the continental inland ice; but the travelling over that distance appears to have been remarkably easy. Frequent excursions were made to that part of the continent where the Gauss-berg protruded. No expeditions further inland were made. This was not due to any difficulty in travelling over the ice, but chiefly to the fact that the permanence of the ship's winter-quarters was open to doubt. So far as can be gathered from the narrative, a succession of north-westerly gales might at any time have broken up the ice; and then the position of a party no farther away than the Gauss-berg would have been precarious. Fortunately the east winds held, and the 'Gauss' never moved; indeed there was every possibility that she might have to pass another winter there.

When she did get free, in the middle of March 1903, there was heavy ice on all sides. An attempt was made to penetrate southwards on the route of the 'Challenger,' but the ice was too close; and in the early days of April the ship bore up for the north, reaching home on Nov. 24, 1903. The work of a busy winter in an antarctic station will be looked forward to with the keenest interest. Drygalski does not anticipate, but in the concluding chapter of his narrative he indicates that the magnetic work was particularly fruitful in results, especially in connexion with the displays of aurora, which were very frequent. A short summary of the meteorological observations could, one would think, have been given without indiscretion; and it would have interested even the least instructed reader.

The British national expedition, under commander Robert F. Scott, R.N., sailed from Cowes on August 6, 1901, in the 'Discovery,' a vessel built especially for the expedition. The ship arrived at the Cape on October 3, and re-

mained there until the 14th, when she left for New Zealand. During the passage she went as far south as lat. $62^{\circ} 50'$ S. in long. 139° E., only about 200 miles north of Adélie Land, discovered by Dumont d'Urville. The final departure for the south was from Port Chalmers, on Dec. 24, 1901. On Jan. 3 the antarctic circle was crossed and the ice-pack entered. This belt of pack-ice proved to be about 200 miles in width; and the 'Discovery' did not get through it until the 8th. On the same evening land was sighted. The weather was perfect; and by the light of the midnight sun the blue outline of the high mountain-peaks of Victoria Land was seen far away to the south and west. The members of the expedition were astonished to find that, even at the great distance of more than a hundred geographical miles, they could clearly distinguish the peaks of the Admiralty range, discovered by Ross some sixty years before.

The ship's course was now directed to Robertson Bay, which is formed by the long gravelly spit which stretches northwards from Cape Adare. It was on this spit that the expedition sent forth by Sir George Newnes, and commanded by Mr Borchgrevink, spent their winter in 1896. On leaving Cape Adare and coasting southwards, the 'Discovery' was destined to experience the might of the tidal currents of these regions, and the risk of encountering them amongst heavy pack-ice. Not having the advantage of steam, Ross was unable to explore this coast closely on account of the extensive pack-ice; but he mapped all the features of the high land. The 'Southern Cross,' with the aid of steam, was able to follow the coast pretty closely in 1897. The 'Discovery' was still more fortunate in 1902, being able to approach some interesting places which were denied to Mr Borchgrevink. With the prevailing easterly and south-easterly winds and the westerly currents, this coast is constantly a lee-shore against which the pack-ice is apt to be pressed very close.

Contrary to expectation, the 'Discovery' was unable to penetrate into Wood Bay, which had been reported by the 'Southern Cross' to be capable of affording snug winter-quarters, with a considerable extent of land free from ice and snow at the base of Mount Melbourne. This fine mountain rears an almost perfect volcanic

cone to a height of 9000 feet; and, standing alone with no competing height to lessen its grandeur, it constitutes the most magnificent landmark on the coast. It is shown in two beautiful photographs to be covered with snow to the summit, with, however, some bare patches of rock. South of this point the character of the Victorian coast changed; and very little snow was observed on the high mountains behind it. In a beautiful sketch by Mr Davis, master of the 'Terror,' preserved in the Hydrographic Office, the diminution of snow on the mountains south of Cape Washington is apparent. It commences, however, with Mount Melbourne itself, which is shown as bare of snow for at least two or three thousand feet from the summit. This suggests the possibility that the volcano may have been active shortly before the date of Ross' visit; and it would tally with the fact that Mount Erebus was in considerable eruption in 1841, though quiescent in 1902. Another remarkable feature of Mr Davis' sketches is that the smoke from Mount Erebus is depicted as travelling from east to west, while during the whole of the sojourn of the 'Discovery' it was observed to travel in the opposite direction. Ross estimated that at each explosion the ejected matter was thrown to a height of 2000 feet above the summit; it may therefore have reached a region where the wind was from the east.

South of Cape Washington, miniature ice-barriers were met with, due to enormous glaciers, one over fifteen miles across, which thrust their snouts many miles out to sea. In Granite Harbour a safe anchorage was found, but it was too much shut off from the south to be selected at once as winter-quarters for the expedition. From Granite Harbour the 'Discovery' reached over towards the great volcano discovered by Ross and named after his ship the 'Erebus.' In doing this, Captain Scott examined McMurdo Bay, afterwards known as McMurdo Sound, and formed the idea that he might winter there.

The 'Discovery' then proceeded along the north coast of what was afterwards called Ross Island, towards the ice barrier *par excellence*. This feature must be reckoned as one of the wonders of the world. No excuse is therefore necessary for quoting the simple narrative of its discovery by Sir James Clark Ross in 1841. It is all the

more important to do so, because there is some conflict between the evidence of Captain Scott and that of Sir James Ross, which is not to be decided off-hand on the mere basis of date.

On Jan. 28, 1841, Ross writes ('Voyage,' i, 218 ff.):—

'As we approached the land under all studding sails, we perceived a low white line extending from its eastern extreme point as far as the eye could discern to the eastward. It presented an extraordinary appearance, gradually increasing in height as we got nearer to it, and proving at length to be a perpendicular cliff of ice between 150 and 200 feet above the level of the sea, perfectly flat and level at the top, and without any fissures or promontories on its even seaward face. What was beyond it we could not imagine; for, being much higher than our mast-head, we could not see anything except the summit of a lofty range of mountains extending to the southward as far as the 79th degree of latitude. These mountains, being the southernmost land hitherto discovered, I felt great satisfaction in naming after Captain Sir William Edward Parry. . . . Whether "Parry Mountains" again take an easterly trending and form the base to which this extraordinary mass of ice is attached, must be left for future navigators to determine. If there be land to the southward, it must be very remote, or of much less elevation than any other part of the coast we have seen, or it would have appeared above the barrier. . . . The day was remarkably fine; and, favoured by a fresh north-westerly breeze, we made good progress to the E.S.E. close along the lofty perpendicular cliffs of the icy barrier.

'Jan. 29. Having sailed along this curious wall of ice in perfectly clear water a distance of upwards of one hundred miles, by noon we found it still stretching to an indefinite extent in an E.S.E. direction. We were at this time in lat. $77^{\circ} 47' S.$, long. $176^{\circ} 43' E.$. . . I went on board the "Terror" for a short time this afternoon (29th Jan.) to consult with Commander Crozier and compare our chronometers and barometers. . . . After an absence now of nearly three months from Van Diemen's Land, the chronometers of the two ships were found to differ only 4" of time, equal to a mile of longitude, or, in this latitude, less than a quarter of a mile of distance.'

These quotations from Ross' voyage show how careful he was about his observations. The position in which he lays down this part of the Barrier may therefore be

accepted with absolute confidence as determined by one of the most experienced, accurate, and cautious officers, controlled and confirmed by the captain and staff of the consort ship. In questions of this kind, and as between the years 1841 and 1902, date counts for nothing in weighing evidence; the determining factor is the competence and the experience of the observer. The 'Discovery' had no second ship to act as control; and none of her officers had experience of polar navigation which could be compared with that of those serving on the 'Erebus' and 'Terror.' When, therefore, other things being equal, there is any conflict between the evidence of the 'Discovery' and that of the 'Erebus' and 'Terror' regarding the determination of geographical positions, we have no hesitation in abiding by those fixed by Sir James Ross and his consort.

Captain Scott writes (vol. i, p. 171):—

Already there was a strong case against the Parry Mountains; and later we knew with absolute certainty that they did not exist; it is difficult to understand what can have led such a cautious and trustworthy observer as Ross to make such an error. I am inclined to think that, in exaggerating the height of the barrier in this region, he was led to suppose that anything seen over it at a distance must necessarily be of very great altitude; but, whatever the cause, the fact shows again how deceptive appearances may be and how easily errors may arise. In fact, as I have said before, one cannot always afford to trust the evidence of one's own eyes.'

As the height of Ross' mast-head would be at least 140 feet above the water, there can be no suspicion of over-estimation when he gives the height of the Barrier as from 150 to 200 feet. The observation of the 'Discovery' that the edge of the Barrier on the west lies further south than it did in Ross' time confirms that made on board the 'Southern Cross'; and the estimates of these two expeditions agree in making its height from 60 to 70 feet. It is obvious that, if twenty miles of the ice have disappeared, the first part to go would be the cliff which Ross surveyed in 1841; and the belief which Captain Scott expresses, that Sir James Ross over-estimated its height, cannot be founded on direct observation. The only legitimate conclusion which can be drawn

from these facts is that the Barrier ice-sheet in this region at the present day has such a thickness, or is otherwise so circumstanced, that it exposes above water a cliff having a height of not more than 60 or 70 feet; whereas, in the year 1841, when it extended some twenty miles farther out to sea, it exposed a cliff of from 150 to 200 feet in height.

The distance from Cape Crozier to the nearest point on the 79th parallel is 90 geographical miles. Captain Scott often remarks on the visibility in these regions of very distant mountain-peaks, e.g. on his first view of the Admiralty range at a distance of over 100 miles, and again when he saw at one moment Mounts Melbourne and Monteagle with Coulman Island to the north and Mount Erebus to the south, 'that is, an included range of vision of 240 geographical miles.' If, then, there are mountains of the requisite height in the required direction, we must conclude that these were the mountains which Ross saw and named the Parry Mountains.

On his map accompanying 'The Voyage of the "Discovery,"' Captain Scott lays down a range of very lofty mountains between the parallels of 78° and 79° S., and he specifies the following peaks with their heights, viz. Mount Lister, 15,384 feet; Mount Hooker, 13,696 feet; Mount Rooker, 12,839 feet; Mount Huggins, 13,801 feet; Mount Harmsworth, 9644 feet; Mount Speyer, 8913 feet; Mounts Dawson and Lambton, 8675 feet; and, further to the west and nearer to the Barrier, Mount Discovery, 9887 feet; Black Island, 3456 feet; Brown Island, 2750 feet; and White Island, 2375 feet.

White Island, Black Island, and Brown Island would be distant from Ross' position between 40 and 45 miles; Mount Discovery would be distant about 50 miles; Mount Huggins about 65 miles; and Mount Harmsworth about 95 miles; and all would bear from south-west to south-south-west. There is nothing in Captain Scott's map to show that they would not be visible on a clear day, so soon as the shoulder of Mount Terror was open to the south-west. Therefore we abide by our conviction that Ross was not mistaken when he reported having seen lofty mountains to the southward, reaching nearly to the 79th parallel; and we are convinced that the above-named peaks are some of those which he saw and named

collectively the Parry Mountains. Lieut. Armitage, in his book, confirms this view. When navigating the ship along the Barrier he saw over its edge these mountains from the crow's nest; and he says they 'were evidently the Parry Mountains of Sir James Ross.'

On Jan. 23, 1902, the 'Discovery' started on her cruise along the Barrier. On Jan. 29 Captain Scott gives his noon position as lat. $78^{\circ} 18' S.$, long. $162^{\circ} 6' W.$; and he remarks that this position is an interesting one, being to the southward and eastward of the extreme position reached by Sir James Ross in 1842, whence he reported a strong appearance of land to the south-east. But this remark of Captain Scott's is inexact.

On Feb. 23, 1842, while approaching the Barrier from the north-west, Ross reports having passed a berg with a large rock on it, apparently about six feet in diameter, followed later by some bergs and pieces of heavy ice with numerous stones and patches of soil, which raised his expectation of sighting land to a high pitch. Ross noticed also that the appearance and character of the Barrier in this locality differed from that presented by the Barrier nearer its western end. Having arrived within a mile and a half of the Barrier, he hove to, in order to allow the 'Terror,' which had dropped behind, to come up, when an interchange of signals between the two ships took place. The latitude of the 'Erebus' was $78^{\circ} 8' S.$, that of the 'Terror' $78^{\circ} 11' S.$, the mean of which, $78^{\circ} 9' 30'' S.$, was adopted; and this placed the face of the Barrier in lat. $78^{\circ} 11' S.$, in the long. of $161^{\circ} 27' W.$ The 'Discovery's' noon position on Jan. 29, 1902 ($78^{\circ} 18' S.$, $162^{\circ} 6' W.$), lies west and not east of this position, the difference in longitude being $39'$; and it is still further to the west of the extreme position reached by Ross. In this position Ross found the height of the highest part of the Barrier to be 107 feet, and observed that from this point it gradually declined for about ten miles to the eastward, where it could not have been more than 80 feet. Ross then made sail along the Barrier to the eastward until he came to the lower part of it above-mentioned, being about ten miles east of his previous position, and therefore about twenty-three miles east and north of the noon position of the 'Discovery' on Jan. 29, 1902. On his arrival at this point, Ross says (vol. ii, p. 202):—

'We perceived from our mast-heads that it [the land] gradually rose to the southward, presenting the appearance of mountains of great height perfectly covered with snow, but with a varied and undulating outline, which the barrier itself could not have assumed. Still there is so much uncertainty attending the appearance of land, when seen at any considerable distance, that although I, in common with nearly all my companions, feel assured that the presence of land there amounts almost to a certainty, yet I am unwilling to hazard the possibility of being mistaken on a point of so much interest, or the chance of some future navigator under more favourable circumstances proving that ours were only visionary mountains

'The appearance of hummocky ridges and different shades, such as would be produced by an irregular white surface, and its mountainous elevation, were our chief grounds for believing it to be land, for not the smallest patch of cliff or rock could be seen protruding on any part of the space of about thirty degrees which it occupied. I have therefore marked it on the chart only as an "appearance of land."'

As on Feb. 23, 1842, in the 'Erebus' and 'Terror,' so on Jan. 29, 1902, in the 'Discovery,' all the appearances of the Barrier suggested the proximity of land. From his noon position on Jan. 29 Captain Scott steamed along the face of the Barrier, and he says (i, 178):

'Our course lay well to the northward of east; and the change came at 8 P.M., when suddenly the ice-cliff turned to the east, and, becoming more and more irregular, continued in that direction for about five miles, when it again turned sharply to the north. Into the deep bay thus formed we ran, and as we approached the ice which lay ahead and to the eastward of us, we saw that it differed in character from anything we had yet seen. The ice-foot descended to varying heights of ten or twenty feet above the water, and behind it the snow surface rose in long undulating slopes to rounded ridges whose height we could only estimate. If any doubt remained in our minds that this was snow-covered land, a sounding of 100 fathoms quickly dispelled it. But what a land! On the swelling mounds of snow above us there was not one break, not a feature to give definition to the hazy outline. Instinctively one felt that such a scene as this was most perfectly devised to produce optical illusions in the explorer, and to cause those errors into which we had found even experienced persons to be led.'

A careful consideration of the positions of the ships as above discussed shows that on the evening of Jan. 29, 1902, the 'Discovery' must have arrived at a position close to that attained by the 'Erebus' and 'Terror' on the evening of Feb. 23, 1842; and the report which each explorer furnished of what he saw can leave no doubt that they were both looking at portions, and probably identical portions, of the same landscape. To Captain Scott, therefore, belongs the honour of confirming Sir James Ross' discovery of land in this part of the south-polar regions, and of vindicating the trustworthiness and the caution of that great navigator.

The 'Discovery' proceeded along the face of the Barrier, or rather the ice-edge which now represented it. On the evening of Jan. 30 small patches of bare rock were detected appearing through the icy covering of the distant high land. After this the ship wandered among ice and fog, but on Feb. 1 she got back to the position where the rock patches had been seen; and, the weather clearing up, a good view was obtained, not only of the coastal range, but also of what was probably the summit of a distant and lofty range of mountains. The 'Discovery' could now return westward with the satisfaction of having not only confirmed the existence of land on the eastern side of the Barrier ice-sheet, but of having to a certain extent delimited it.

On Feb. 3 the 'Discovery' entered the same creek as, or one in the immediate neighbourhood of, that in which the 'Southern Cross' moored in 1897. While lying alongside the ice-wharf for twenty-four hours, the ship and wharf rose and fell together, so that the ice-sheet was afloat. As the depth of the water was 315 fathoms, it could not well be otherwise. Captain Scott makes the important observation that the surface current set into the Barrier and under the ice for a certain time, then turned and set out again to sea. It would be very interesting to know how far 'inland' this flux and reflux penetrates. The surface of the ice is smooth and undulating; an extensive view of it was obtained from the captive balloon.

On Feb. 8, 1902, the 'Discovery' was brought into the bay which was to be her winter-quarters; but the weather persistently declined to freeze her in. As a matter of

fact the open season was only beginning. It was not until March 24 that the ice between the stern of the ship and the shore was strong enough to bear the weight of a man; and then the bow of the ship was in open water. Almost up to the date of the disappearance of the sun (April 20), open water frequently appeared outside that point. Indeed, the behaviour of the ice in the neighbourhood of Ross Island was at all seasons very capricious. One of the first expeditions undertaken after the return of the sun was to Cape Crozier, to deposit a record for the relief ship. On Oct. 13, corresponding to our April, the party arrived at the cliffs above that cape, from which they had an extensive view over the ice-bound sea. From the 12th to the 18th the party were confined to their tents by a blizzard, during which they were almost buried by the drifting snow. When they were able to quit their tents, they found that the Ross Sea, which before the storm had been frozen over as far as the eye could see, was now a sheet of open water. Not a scrap of ice remained in sight, excepting the small shelf immediately under the Barrier, which formed the breeding-place of the Emperor Penguin. It is very difficult to account for the phenomenon, unless the whole pack was moved bodily seaward. The movements of the ice and of the water in this district deserve close study.

As a centre of exploring expeditions the winter-quarters proved very advantageous. Besides many short expeditions to the nearer islands and channels, which furnished much useful information, the principal sledge-journeys in the first season were that to the farthest south led by Captain Scott, and that to the high plateau of inland ice to the westward led by Mr Armitage. In the second season the principal expedition was that of Captain Scott to the farthest west on the lofty plateau of the inland ice. All these journeys are remarkable achievements; and they show Captain Scott at his best, as a man of indomitable pluck and energy, who not only did the hardest work himself, but was able to get others to follow suit, and to do so willingly and cheerfully.

On his journey to the farthest south, Captain Scott started on Nov. 2, 1902, from the winter-quarters of the 'Discovery' in lat. $77^{\circ} 52'$ S. Immediately to the southward lay White Island, Black Island, and the Minna

Bluff, a long ridge stretching eastwards from Mount Discovery. These necessitated a detour over the ice to the eastward. About eight or nine miles off the extremity of Minna Bluff a station, called depôt A, was made. This was not only of great importance to Captain Scott's party on their return journey, when, besides other misfortunes, they were nearly at the end of their provisions, but it was the means of revealing the fact that the ice in this district moves northward at the rate of between 500 and 600 yards per annum. Further observations, however, will be required before it can be accepted that the Barrier ice-sheet has a general motion at this rate.

From depôt A the route continued southwards until lat. $79^{\circ} 40'$ S. was reached; the mountainous coast-line on the west having been kept at a distance of about seventy miles. From here the course was altered to south-west in order to close the coast and, if possible, to land. A second depôt (B) was established in lat. $80^{\circ} 25'$ S.; and here attempts to land were made, but they were defeated by crevasses and other ice disturbances. From depôt B the course was continued southwards in discouraging circumstances, against which few would have been able to make head.

On December 28, the camp was pitched in lat. $82^{\circ} 11'$ S.; and, although the actual 'farthest south' $82^{\circ} 17'$ S. was reached on the 30th, the weather both on the 29th and the 30th was thick so that no distant view could be obtained. On the 28th Captain Scott writes (ii, 76):—

'It is a glorious evening, and fortune could not have provided us with a more perfect view of our surroundings. We are looking up a broad deep inlet or strait which stretches away to the south-west for thirty or forty miles before it reaches its boundary of cliff and snow slope. Beyond, rising fold on fold, are the great *névé* fields that clothe the distant range; against the pale blue sky the outline of the mountain ridge rises and falls over numerous peaks till, with a sharp turn upward, it culminates in the lofty summit of Mt Markham. . . . The eastern foothills of the high range form the southern limit of the strait; they are fringed with high cliffs and steep snow-slopes. . . . Between the high range and the barrier there must lie immense undulating snow plateaux covering the lesser foothills, which seem rather to increase in height to the left until they fall sharply to the barrier level almost due

south of us. To the eastward of this again, we get our view to the farthest south; and we have been studying it again and again to gather fresh information with the changing bearings of the sun. Mount Longstaff we calculate as 10,000 feet. It is formed by the meeting of two long and comparatively regular slopes; that to the east stretches out into the barrier and ends in a long snow-cape which bears about S. 14° E.; that to the west is lost behind the nearer foothills; but now fresh features have developed about these slopes.

'Over the western ridge can be seen two new peaks which must lie considerably to the south of the mountain, and, more interesting still, beyond the eastern cape we catch a glimpse of an extended coast-line; the land is thrown up by mirage, and appears in small white patches against a pale sky. We know well this appearance of a snow-covered country. It is the normal view in these regions of a very distant lofty land, and it indicates with certainty that a mountainous country continues beyond Mount Longstaff for nearly fifty miles. The direction of the extreme land thrown up in this manner is S. 17° E.; and hence we can now say with certainty that the coast-line, after passing Mount Longstaff, continues in this direction for at least a degree of latitude.'

'Instinctively' the reader feels (as Captain Scott felt on a previous occasion) 'that such a scene is most perfectly devised to produce optical illusions'; and he will reflect that, however certain the explorer may be, it might have been prudent, in dealing with these great distances, to confine his report to 'appearances of land.'

On Jan. 13, 1903, depôt B was fortunately found. The provisions there picked up made the conditions in respect of food favourable; but the strength of the party was diminishing, and the health of one of their number—Lieutenant Shackleton—caused serious misgiving. The dogs had long ceased to be of any use for dragging, and had had to be sacrificed. A straight course was now made to depôt A, which was reached on Jan. 28, and the party joined the ship on Feb. 3. The journey had occupied 93 days; and during it 960 statute miles were covered. The credit which is due to Captain Scott and his companions in this journey can only be appreciated by those who read the account of it, and know something of what arctic travelling is.

During the whole of his journey Captain Scott travelled on the ice-sheet, which terminates northward in what is

known as the Great Barrier. This is land-ice, not sea-ice. Through four and a half degrees of latitude it maintained the same level; and Captain Scott concludes that it is afloat. If this be so, then the Ross Sea stretches at least to latitude 83° S.; and, as there were no signs to the southward of a change in the character of the scenery, it is impossible to guess how much farther it may stretch. There was no appearance of this *mer de glace* being delimited by a coast on the east. In the latitude of the Barrier, which may be taken as 78° S., the ice lies between longitude 160° E. and 160° W. It extends therefore over 40° of longitude, or about 480 nautical miles. In latitude 83° the same distance in longitude would equal 290 nautical miles, a distance which would preclude the possibility of seeing land, even if of great height. The possibility of the existence of a deep inland sea, such as that discovered by Nansen in the north, with a depth of perhaps 2000 fathoms, is not excluded; but the source, if a source be required, of the ice that forms the sheet which ends in the Great Barrier, becomes more and more puzzling the further south it is shifted. It may lie on the other side of the Pole; for instance, on the southern declivities of Coats' Land. If the observed dislocation of depôt A is to be taken as any indication of the movement of the ice-sheet as a whole, the supply of ice must be enormous; and, bearing in view the scarcity of precipitation in those high polar latitudes, it is almost impossible to imagine where the supply is to be found. The subject is full of difficulties, but all of them are fascinating; and before long the solution of the problem will attract not one or two but many, who will have to thank Captain Scott and his brave companions, Dr Wilson and Lieutenant Shackleton, for having shown the way.

Not less remarkable than his journey to the farthest south was Captain Scott's expedition in the spring of 1903 to the high continental plateau behind the lofty mountains which bounded the view from the winter-quarters towards the west. In the preceding season an important expedition had been carried out in the same direction by his second in command, Mr Armitage, who performed a mountaineering feat which would daunt most Alpine guides. He took his expedition, dragging everything in the way of provisions and shelter for fifty-two days, on

sledges up glaciers and over ridges never before trodden by man, to a height of 9000 feet, at a temperature generally about that which freezes quicksilver. Captain Scott was able to improve on the road; but he had abundance of other difficulties to overcome, and he overcame them most successfully. While he did not attain any greater height than Mr Armitage, he pushed on beyond his turning-point, and travelled over the continental plateau at a height of 8000 to 9000 feet for a distance of 12° of longitude, or 150 nautical miles, preserving an average latitude of about 77° 45' S. It will be long before this achievement is surpassed.

It has not been possible to notice the other expeditions made by the crew of the 'Discovery'; but every member was busy, and contributed his best to the great fund of new knowledge which is the result of the two years' sojourn in south-polar regions. At the end of Captain Scott's book summaries of results of observations are given by himself and several members of the staff which throw much new light on these interesting regions, and at the same time raise many questions which it is not easy to answer.

The ice of the great tabular bergs was known to be vesicular, belonging rather to the *névé* than to the glacier type. The ice of the Great Barrier appears to be of this character. This sheet consists, for at least a considerable thickness below its surface, of snow, more or less consolidated and passing into *névé*. Excavation showed many thin sheets or crusts of solid ice intercalated with the snow; and in this respect it resembles the winter snow of the High Alps. To what extent consolidation takes place in the deeper layers of the ice is uncertain. Captain Scott's impression was that the mass must throughout contain large quantities of air, an impression supported by the examination of some ice taken from the bottom of an overturned berg. Theoretically this appears to us to be likely. According to Buchanan's theory the motion of a glacier under the influence of gravity is intimately connected with the melting and regelation, or generally the metamorphosis, of the grains of which it is composed, in a medium containing varying though minute quantities of dissolved matter. The variation of the dilution of the medium is accompanied by variation of its

freezing temperature. When ice is removed from it by freezing, the grain immersed in it increases, and the freezing-point of the medium falls. When ice is removed from the grain by melting, the medium is diluted and its freezing-point rises. The effect produced molecularly by variation of dilution is similar to that produced mechanically by increase and diminution of pressure. The maximum size of the grain at any point in a glacier is roughly a function of its distance from the source, and is a measure of the amount of metamorphism which the ice has experienced ('Antarctic Manual,' pp. 93, 94). If the Barrier ice-sheet is a self-contained *névé* or *firn*, situated at, and to a great extent below, the level of the sea—and we think that Captain Scott's observations clearly point to its being so—it can have no motion in its mass under gravity, and cannot therefore develop the adult grain of the glacier. Its granular structure must remain rudimentary like that of the *névé*. Being already at the lowest possible level, glaciers cannot flow from it; and its surplus material is dispersed as icebergs, which are thus generated directly by the *névé*.

It is remarkable that, in spite of the very low temperature continuously experienced by the expedition, in certain parts, as on the Ferrar glacier, there was at the beginning of January, locally at least, extensive melting of the ice. The Ferrar glacier appeared to be stationary. There must, however, have been at some time considerable motion of ice from the inner highland to the level of the sea, or to that of the Barrier sheet, in order to furnish the abundance of moraine matter which is found on Ross Island, covers White Island nearly to the summit, and is distributed all over the lower ice-flats in the vicinity of the 'Discovery's' winter-quarters. When a glacier is moving, it develops of itself the heat which initiates and promotes the metamorphosis of the ice. No information as to the size of the grain of these glaciers is given; and indeed it is not easy to obtain it in latitudes where the power of the sun, even at midday, is insufficient to disarticulate completely the grains of a mass of ice. The ice of the inland plateau seems to be an accumulation of snow more or less consolidated; the annual increment, if any, is probably small. The continuous and violent westerly wind appears to keep it

always on the move, and Captain Scott formed the view that the snow which is evaporated probably equals, and may exceed, that which is precipitated, so that the ice-covering is not increasing, and may indeed be diminishing. All the ice and snow on the antarctic continent represents water removed from the southern ocean by the westerly winds. As in other land masses exposed to moist winds, the first high land that the air meets deprives it of the greater part of its moisture. On passing farther inland it contains so little that it has almost none to deposit. As regards the supply of material, the Barrier ice-sheet seems to be more favourably situated than the inland plateau. According to Captain Scott's experience, it is frequently swept by warm snow-laden southerly winds, which must be the return northwards of the upper westerly winds, shown by the smoke from Mount Erebus to be a very constant feature at high levels.

It is interesting to notice that Mr Ferrar, the geologist of the expedition, has arrived quite independently at the conviction that a covering of ice, so far from being destructive, is an eminently conservative agent as regards the land surface beneath. This conviction was arrived at by the writer many years ago; but it was due to the contemplation of the far-reaching destruction produced by the warm moist air of equatorial regions on unprotected rock surfaces.

From all the observations there appears to be no doubt that there has been a great diminution of the icy covering of the land in a period the length of which there are no adequate data to determine; and it is argued that the climate of Victoria Land must have changed very much in the interval. Those who have had the opportunity of witnessing during their lifetime the enormous removal of ice from the surface of Switzerland without the occurrence, according to meteorological data, of any appreciable change in the climate, will not attach too much importance to this conclusion.

Captain Scott returned from his great journey to the farthest west on Christmas eve, 1902. During his absence much work had been done in preparing the ship for sea and in attacking the ice with saws. On Jan. 5, 1903, to the surprise of every one, two relief ships appeared; but they were unable, owing to the fast ice, to approach

within less than ten miles of the 'Discovery.' It was not until Feb. 17 that everything was ready and the three ships left McMurdo Sound. The journey home was effected without further incident.

To the selfish reader of Captain Scott's charming and instructive book the relief of the 'Discovery' comes as a disappointment. Having followed him in his first, or apprentice's, journey to the farthest south, and seen how he every day gathered more and more experience of the work; having then followed him in his next journey to the farthest west, and observed the remarkable development of his power of covering ground against difficulties, it is impossible not to regret that he was unable to deliver the master-stroke by following up his own pioneer work and going still farther south, perhaps to the Pole itself.

We think that it would have been legitimate for Captain Scott to take the view that his expedition had a quasi-warlike character. He was engaged, as Dr H. R. Mill puts it, in the siege of the South Pole. The attack of the fortress had to be delivered on land, and claimed the presence of the chief. The service of support and relief had to be conducted by sea, and fell naturally under the command of a subordinate. Such a scheme of division of labour would have offered many advantages. The costly ship would have continued to be active in the service of the expedition, which would then have become self-supporting; and every department of it would have come under the immediate personal control of Captain Scott. The reappearance of the 'Discovery' in Australian waters in April 1902 would have relieved the promoters of the expedition of the obligation to find a second ship, and would have been welcomed by the friends of all the members of the expedition, about whom some anxiety had begun to be expressed. Indeed there would have been no necessity to evacuate Ross Land at all; for the members of the expedition could have been relieved and replaced, and the occupation continued, until the fortress had fallen. The public is never backward in supporting an enterprise when it has begun to show sure prospects of success.

Art. III.—THE ROMANTIC ELEMENT IN MUSIC.

1. *The Oxford History of Music*. Vol. v: The Viennese Period, by W. H. Hadow. Vol vi: The Romantic Period, by E. Dannreuther. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1904-6.
2. *J. S. Bach, le Musicien-Poète*. By Albert Schweitzer. Leipzig: Breitkopf and Haertel, 1905.
3. *Richard Wagner, 1813-34*. By the late Hon. Mrs Burrell. Privately printed, 1906.
4. *Johannes Brahms*. By Max Kalbeck. Vol I (1833-1862). Vienna and Leipzig: Wiener Verlag, 1904.
5. *The Life of Johannes Brahms*. By Florence May. Two vols. London: Arnold, 1905.
6. *Clara Schumann*. By Bernhard Litzmann. Two vols. Leipzig: Breitkopf and Haertel, 1902-6.
7. *Life and Letters of Peter Ilich Tchaikovsky*. By Modeste Tchaikovsky. Edited from the Russian with an introduction by Rosa Newmarch. London: Lane, 1906.

THE famous antithesis between 'Classical' and 'Romantic,' which is probably due to Goethe, provides a couple of useful labels for analysts of works of art who do not want the trouble of thinking for themselves; but, like other antitheses, it is often misleading, for its terms are far from being mutually exclusive. The whole of art will not by any cajolery be induced to fall definitely into one category or the other; for every really romantic work has in it the germ of vitality which some day will raise it to the rank of a classic; and every true classic has been inspired by the passionate desire to express, in terms of art, some spiritual vision, some flash of inspiration, which is at the root of the romantic idea. While the greatest things in painting, poetry, or music, are at once romantic and classical, and while it is only necessary to turn to the walls of the Royal Academy of Arts, the shelves of the publishers, and the programmes of the concerts, for manifold examples of things which are neither one nor the other, yet there is a real opposition between the two elements, not so much in the works of art themselves, as in the mental attitudes of their creators.

While the world endures, creative artists will obey one primary impulse; this man will seek above all things to

find expression for his idea in any form that may chance, so long as the idea is expressed ; that man will be almost indifferent to the essential value of his thought if he may but clothe it in a beautiful and becoming garment. To the one, the substance or content of his work seems all-sufficient, to the other its form. These are of course the two extremes of the Romantic and Classical schools respectively ; in all the arts there have happily been men who gave due regard alike to form and content, and from among these it might be maintained that the greatest men have come. Of Beethoven, as of Shakespeare, it is impossible to assert with confidence that either form or content was paramount in the original conception. If Beethoven were not universally accepted as the greatest of all the classics, one would hesitate in which class to place him ; for his ideas are presented in a manner untrammelled by formal conventions, while in the very course of their expression, as it seems, the greatest mastery of design is manifested.

A large view of all the arts will reveal the fact that the successive ideals of great men follow a regular sequence and recur in the same order. First, there is the man who is so delighted at having something to express, some real, new message to the world, that he cares little for the form of its expression ; this freedom, with his followers, degenerates into license and formlessness ; as a protest against this formlessness, beauty and symmetry of design are in the next period placed, it may be, above the weighty thought, form above content ; and, after this stage the love of form degenerates into formalism and conventionality. Again, as a protest against this last, the essential thought is once more exalted above design ; and the formula is endlessly repeated—Content above Form : Formlessness : Form above Content : Formality.

The whole art of the Renaissance is an example of the spirit of protest against the free forms of Gothic art ; the literary movement that culminated in the work of the Lake poets is a protest against the polished couplets of the school of Pope and Dryden, whose work, in turn, was in more or less conscious opposition to the poetry of that Romantic school which came to an end in Donne. Pre-raphaelitism and Impressionism in painting are a dual protest against the convention into which pictorial art

fell in the middle of the Victorian era; and the great revolutions of music had their root in the desire to be freed from stifling formalism. Monteverde, Caccini, and the rest of the monodists, groped their way with feeble steps towards the direct expression of dramatic emotions, and thereby founded modern music; Gluck broke away from the cold formalism of Handelian opera, Wagner from the endless succession of trills and roulades that had satisfied the admirers of Rossini and his contemporaries; and each of these men created a change that can only be described as a revolution.

Just as Gluck, before reforming the opera of his day, conformed to the conventions of the men before him, so Wagner, in his earliest works, and even as far down the list of his works as 'Rienzi,' wrote music that is indistinguishable from the orthodox productions of the day. The wonderful and literally monumental life of Wagner, begun by the late Hon. Mrs Burrell, and issued to a few privileged persons by her husband and daughter, gives specimens which are quite enough to prove how little the great champion of operatic reform realised his mission at first. The book is not printed but engraved throughout, and is illustrated by facsimiles of every document quoted; so that it whets one's impatience to know how the later part of the history would have been treated by so conscientious a worker as Mrs Burrell, who spared neither money nor pains, to get at the exact truth. Many as have been the biographies of the composer, and loud as has been the chorus of praise bestowed upon each, it was reserved for Mrs Burrell to establish the accurate form of his mother's maiden name. As a study of a revolutionary in embryo, the volume (of which a copy is in the British Museum) is of surpassing interest.

So strong a word as 'revolution' can perhaps only be applied with justice to the transition from formality to formlessness. More gradual and more peaceful are the steps which lead from formlessness to design. The change from chaos to cosmos is not noisy, but it is not for that reason the less momentous. As a matter of fact, those who restore the arts of design attack a defenceless position. Formlessness has no bulwarks for its shelter; it has no school, for, if it had, it must cease to be formless and itself become conventionalised. The master of design, the man

who can clothe his thought in a fitting garment, has something definite to show which appeals to every intelligent hearer. The musical period that is known as the 'Classical' exhibits the process most instructively. It centres so entirely round Vienna that the penultimate volume of the 'Oxford History of Music,' in which Mr Hadow treats of the classical masters with his usual brilliance and insight, bears for its subtitle the words, 'The Viennese Period.'

The development of the great classical form for the first and most important movement of a work that is sometimes called 'sonata form,' and sometimes, by an unfortunate ambiguity, 'binary' or 'ternary' form, is the central point of interest in the history. The two ambiguous terms are so misleading that it might be wise to discard them altogether. In the original intention, 'binary' stands for that form in two divisions in which, as a rule in earlier specimens, only a single thematic germ is developed; at a point rather less than half-way along the movement, a stop is made, and in the regular way there is a double bar with the repetition of the section on each side of it in the older pattern, and of the preceding section only in the newer. As time went on, the interest of composers became more and more centred on the portion which immediately succeeded this dividing point. In key-relationship, the dividing point represented a key moderately removed from the original tonality; and from that point a return was made, gradually or suddenly, to the original key. This returning process, called variously 'free fantasia,' *durchführung*, and 'working-out,' is the section in which originality of design has the fullest scope, and in which, as a matter of fact, the greatness of the greatest musicians is most conspicuous. As the first portion of the movement is repeated, after the return to the original key, in all its essential features, it seems rather a pity not to accept the formula 'A, B, A,' and still to call the form a 'binary' one, rather than to insist that the formula is 'A, B, C,' and so to claim the title 'ternary.' This, however, is but a small point in regard to the history of the development of the form which, more than any other, has carried the greatest thoughts of the greatest musicians through the ages. An essential feature of it, in its maturity, is the presence of two principal subjects,

which are announced in a recognised succession, presented in certain conventional ways, and finally united in the same key surroundings. It is at once clear that the analogy of the average love-story, in which we follow the adventures of two personages from their first meeting until their union, is close, and enlightening to a student of form; and here is another of the points at which the classical and romantic elements touch most instructively.

Where and how did the 'two-subject' form take its rise? This is a question which has never been quite satisfactorily settled; and even Mr Hadow does not make it altogether clear. In Sebastian Bach there is little or no trace of it; though his movements are often divided into two sections, they are for the most part built on a single theme; and, when he uses more themes than one, as in the various concerto movements, one subject is generally identified with the solo instrument or the solo group of instruments, the other with the accompaniment. The two are presented in a manner quite different from that which was usual in the sonatas of a later day. Domenico Scarlatti's many 'sonatas' for harpsichord occasionally show a rudimentary 'two-subject' form; but in nearly all of these the 'working-out' section is of the most timid and cursory kind.

It is generally held to have been Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach who presented us with the earliest instances of the type of movement with all its essential features complete; and in certain of his works it is undoubtedly true that this type appears. The curious thing is, however, that, having invented or discovered so beautiful a pattern as the 'two-subject' form, he should not have used it more often; it appears, but in the same set of sonatas in which it occurs other forms of far less significance appear side by side with it. It is a little as though some poet had stumbled on the sonnet form, complete with its number of lines and rhyme-scheme, and, after using it once or twice in a volume, had passed on to other patterns of verse far inferior in organic value. In Haydn—who for a time was C. P. E. Bach's contemporary—and in Mozart, the 'two-subject' form was accepted as the regular type for all instrumental music of a serious aim; and exceptions in their works are as rare as specimens of the 'two-subject' type are in those of C. P. E. Bach. The mystery

is, at what point of time did musicians realise the possibilities concealed in the 'two-subject' pattern, and virtually settle to discard all other possible types of composition for this alone? It is hardly possible that we should ever know, unless letters should some day turn up dated from the few years during which Emanuel Bach and Haydn were working, as it were, side by side.

The books before us throw much light on these and kindred problems. Mr Hadow is always brilliant and suggestive; and nothing in his volume of the *Oxford History* is better in this way than the opening chapter, 'On the General Condition of Taste in the Eighteenth Century.' It must always be a problem how a century in other ways so artificial and conventional should have given birth to the greatest of all the masters of music; but the forces that culminated in Beethoven are here set forth with vivid realisation and perfect truth. On 'The Conflict of Styles,' and on all which deals with the opera, the author is at his best; in the instrumental forms he traces the influence of Haydn and Mozart upon Beethoven; and, naturally, he does not forget his own researches into the source of many of Haydn's themes, as preserved in his valuable little study for this book, 'A Croatian Composer.' On Beethoven, nothing of equal value in so short a compass as the single chapter in which he is here discussed has yet appeared; every word tells, and room is even found to expose the generally accepted myth about Haydn's having disapproved of Beethoven's early trio in C minor. The final chapter on 'Song' sums up the fruit of the whole period in weighty and memorable words. The volume, as a whole, is certainly one of the most valuable of the series.

There is no reason to doubt that, but for the untoward circumstances of the author's illness and death before his contribution could appear, Mr Dannreuther's volume on the Romantic period would have been a great deal better than it is; those who recognise the author's genius and insight will of course be most thankful that he was spared to finish the actual writing of it, and for the sake of what is most precious will forgive the many misprints and peculiarities of arrangement. In reading it we have to accept the narrower use of the word Romantic—that use which has been current since Goethe's day; this being

granted, Mr Dannreuther's volume is an admirable study of the Romantic movement as it affected musicians after the great days of the Classical school of Vienna. He points out how the operatic subjects of Weber, the names chosen for his works by Schumann, the illustrative overtures of Mendelssohn, the melodramas preferred for musical setting by Verdi in his earlier years, all have their rise in a taste for the literature of their day, and how the musical and literary movements ran side by side. The volume embraces everything that can be called distinctively 'Romantic'; and this is nearly identical with the music of the whole nineteenth century.

While the opinions of the writer may possibly not coincide with what everybody thinks to-day, they are absolutely sound, and will be the common property of all critics in twenty, fifty, or a hundred years' time. There is, however, one very strange omission—that of any continuous and detailed survey of the work of Johannes Brahms. That master's name occurs very often in the book; and from the use made of his works as standards of comparison, it is clear that Dannreuther had the utmost reverence and love for his work; but when men like Cornelius, von Bülow, Rubinstein, and even the young Russian composers, are treated in detail, there is no adequate reason for the grave omission of the greatest man of the latter half of the nineteenth century. In the fact that his work is almost confined to the latter half of the century is to be found the actual, if inadequate, reason of this omission; for, as the preface states, the scope of the history had to be modified after this volume was planned. The six volumes were originally to have stopped short of the Wagner controversy; and 1850, or, more precisely, 1856, the year of Schumann's death, was fixed as the limit of the period. In such a plan Brahms, of course, would find no place; but neither would the younger Russians, Cornelius, or Goetz. César Franck is another name which, if these were included, deserved far more than a passing reference; but the most serious blot on the book is undoubtedly the omission of a critical study, such as Dannreuther could have given us, of the work of Brahms.

That the writer's judgment would have been of great value is proved by the moderation of his views on Liszt

and his music. Dannreuther was numbered among the first and most faithful of the English admirers of Wagner; and he speaks of the music-dramas with the understanding born of a deep study of their contents. But his estimate of Liszt underwent very considerable modification in his later years; and no more just, temperate, or far-sighted judgments are to be found anywhere than those which may be gathered from the different parts of this volume on Liszt's music and on his qualities and defects as an artist, whether creative or interpretative. On the eternal dispute between the musical colourists and the designers—the antithesis is temptingly like that between the Romantic and the Classical schools—and on the propriety of 'programme music,' there are words which students would do well to lay to heart. Programme music is described as music 'posing as an unsatisfactory kind of poetry.' And the following is as true as it is tersely expressed: 'By devices of orchestration the colourist tries to reach that which the melodist fails to attain for want of warmth, the harmonist for want of power, and the designer for want of skill.' This is spoken especially of Liszt's symphonic poems; but it is generally as well as specially true.

The omission of a thorough study of Brahms' music from Mr Dannreuther's volume is especially to be regretted, because it gives colour to the silly practice, habitual with some modern critics, of referring to Brahms as belonging to the 'coldly Classical' school, and as if he eschewed romance altogether. Even in the more limited sense of the word, as opposed to the conventional style of the Classicists, there can be no need to remind musicians that Brahms' mastery of musical design did not prevent his being also a poet of the deepest imagination. In songs like the whole of the 'Magelone' cycle, in 'Die Mainacht,' 'Von ewiger Liebe,' 'Immer leiser,' 'Feldeinsamkeit,' and many more, there is the quintessence of romance as usually understood. In all four of the symphonies, in the two overtures, and in the chamber-music, point after point could be adduced as evidence of this quality. How should 'romance' be defined so as to exclude the famous horn passage before the finale of the C minor symphony, the close of the first movement of the second, or, in the third, the delicate melancholy of

the allegretto, or the final summing-up of the whole work in the coda of the last movement, with the lightly breathed allusion, quite at the end, to the opening theme of the symphony? Those who maintain the narrower interpretation of the word 'romantic' are fond of sorting everything they hear into the two classes of Romantic and Non-romantic, according to certain arbitrary standards. If, say they, a man scores well, if his orchestration glows with beautiful colour from end to end, he is, by that fact, a Romantic. Now Brahms, it cannot be denied, does not always move us to ecstasy by the mere sound of his orchestra; but the fact that he knows, quite as well as some of the mere colourists, how to give value to a special instrument for a special purpose, and that he thrills his hearers at particular moments with the quality of certain tones, has not prevented the critics just referred to from calling him a bad scorer, or placing him among the writers whom they choose to dub cold and classical.

These critics are fond, too, of labelling composers as Romantic or Non-romantic according to whether they have obviously taken suggestions or inspirations from literature and external objects, or not. That such suggestions may have been taken without the composer feeling called upon to take the world into his confidence does not seem to have dawned on the critics' minds. One man may have felt the sweet influences of nature, the fellowship of books, or the charm of friendship, quite as vividly as another; but unless he is careful, in bringing out his work, to tell the programme-writer that on a certain day last August he was lying on a cliff so many feet above the sea-level, that bells from the neighbouring village, the wash of the waves below his cliff, the scent of the grass on which he lay, or of the cigar he was smoking, the scream of a sea-bird, or of a railway-whistle in the distance, all wound themselves into a musical picture in his brain, he cannot be accepted by the public as a Romantic. He will do well, too, in the sad event of his not owning a surname that begins with a letter identified with one of the musical notes, to choose a wife whose Christian name can be expressed in a musical phrase. There are indeed not many names that can be pressed into the service as easily as 'Ada'; but, if the composer succeeds in introducing something of this kind into his

work, he is sure of attention from those who are always on the look-out for 'imaginative' (!) work. It is not perceived that the merits of the music, as such, are entirely distinct from such exhibitions of childish ingenuity as this. Schumann's 'Carneval' would have lost no jot of romance if the theme had not been built on the musical letters of the composer's name or those which indicate the town where a friend lived; but, because Schumann took this suggestion, he is held as a typical Romanticist, although his claims to that title rest on far different grounds. There is a string quartet composed in collaboration by several of the young Russian school, built on the theme 'b-la-f' in honour of a generous publisher. If that quartet is good music, it may very possibly be Romantic; but such an arbitrary choice of theme as this cannot add to its romance.

It is probably from the desire to enrol Brahms' name among those of the recognised Romantics that Herr Max Kalbeck, in the first instalment of his life of the master, has gone out of his way to prove that an important subject in the G major sextet was deliberately constructed so as to allude to the name of a young lady with whom the biographer supposes Brahms to have been in love. He may have been in love with one young lady or another, and even have intended to express the words 'Agathe, ade!' in musical notes; but as, unlike Schumann, he has given us no clue to the meaning of the succession of notes except as a succession of notes—and a very beautiful one it is—it would have been better had the writer refrained from guessing.

Again, in dealing with the long friendship between Brahms and Frau Clara Schumann, Herr Kalbeck allows the reader to suppose that the young man was attracted to the widowed pianist by a feeling warmer than that quasi-filial tenderness which has seemed to some people one of the most beautiful things in modern musical history. Happily the truth is stated as plainly as possible in Miss Florence May's admirable and complete life of Brahms, and in the second volume of Herr Litzmann's life of Frau Schumann. The former is indeed an achievement of which English people may well be proud, for, as a portrait of one of the most individual men who have ever lived, as a faithful account of his

outwardly uneventful career, and as a record (from personal experience) of his methods of teaching, the book leaves nothing to be desired. Herr Litzmann's life of Frau Schumann has many more of the obvious elements of romance in it; the love-story told in the first volume is as interesting as a study by Henry James, so complex were the two natures, and so minutely are they analysed. The second volume (a third is to complete the record) stops short at Frau Schumann's first visit to England, so that English readers will with all the more eagerness look forward to the third; it contains the history of her devotion to her husband up to the tragedy which darkened both their lives.

Until the coming of the crisis in Schumann's mental state made it imperative to place him under restraint, husband and wife kept a joint diary in which they recorded their inmost thoughts, their impressions of music and performances, and everything else that happened to them. To this precious document Herr Litzmann has had access, so that the public is admitted to the closest secrets of two personalities that must have been strangely fascinating, in spite of many peculiarities of manner and even of disposition. The story is ineffably sad, but intensely interesting; and, whatever we may think as to the propriety of allowing all and sundry to pry into such an intimate document as the diary, it must be admitted that the author has done his task well; and it is to be guessed that certain things are, after all, still kept back. Even such sordid details as the difficulty of finding a place where the pianist could practise unheard by the composer are not without their pathos when we remember who the pianist and the composer were; and surely never was there a clearer case of the truth of Goethe's words, 'Wer nie sein Brod mit Thränen ass, . . . Der kennt Sie nicht, Ihr himmlische Mächte.'

Even without this documentary evidence as to the years of anxiety that Clara Schumann underwent, the public already knew that her playing was in part the fruit of deep sorrow; but this volume shows us how continuous were the sorrow and the anxiety, though the story is often brightened by rapturous exaltation over some unusually fine performance or some friend gained for Robert's music. In the present day, when his music

seems to appeal directly to the average person, it is curious to recall how long it was in obtaining its due recognition; for, even in Germany, the vogue of Mendelssohn was so enormous that no other ideals than his could be recognised. That both Brahms and Joachim helped largely in the propaganda is well known; and the devoted friendship of all three is made fully manifest in this biography of the lady who was the centre of their circle.

It is a peculiar excellence of Herr Litzmann that he is not afraid to show the little peculiarities of the illustrious couple, and that he does not attempt to idealise them out of all semblance to human beings. They cannot have been altogether or always very agreeable acquaintances. Towards those whom they took to their hearts nothing could have been more genial; and both husband and wife had the gift of endearing others to themselves; but, outside this inner circle, their straightforwardness of conviction, and the absence of any outward polish, such as most people get unconsciously by intercourse with the world, must have brought strange things about. Two striking instances are given. One is an account from the diary itself, of a singularly unpleasant evening spent in the company of Liszt and the Princess von Sayn-Wittgenstein, who were the guests of the Schumanns. As long as the music played by this quartet of distinguished people was Schumann's, all went well; but, when Liszt 'obliged' with some of his new compositions, Frau Schumann confesses that she was unable to get out any words, as even the most superficial expression of thanks for his trouble seemed to her a breach of artistic conscientiousness. On another occasion Félicien David, whom Frau Schumann had asked for an autograph, sent her not merely a signature, but a graceful little tribute to the simple nobility of her art. To this she rejoined in a very curt note, beginning 'Madame Schumann n'ayant pas demandé une attestation pour son album,' etc.

Nevertheless, if there are such traces of something which sounds like discourtesy, there are plenty of passages in which the real tender heart of the woman is laid bare; and the characteristic bluntness only makes the picture more life-like. It may encourage those who have not the gift of immediately discerning greatness to know that Frau Schumann's first impression of Joachim's

playing was far from favourable. While acknowledging his perfect mastery of the instrument and wonderful technique, she goes on to say, 'He lacks the quality that makes one get cold and hot, there is neither sentiment (*Gemüth*) nor fire in him, and he has no chance of a great artistic future.' It is only fair to add that she expressed, a few days afterwards, her sense of her entire mistake; and her biographer gives the entry in the diary, not from any desire to belittle her critical faculty, but just to show how often great musicians' judgments are mistaken. To set against this there is a very curious and interesting verdict of Frau Schumann's on Brahms' trio in B minor, which may possibly have had some influence on the composer, who, as is well known, rewrote the work in later life. 'I wished nothing altered, except a new first movement, for I cannot enter into this one, although the opening is splendid.'

Whether it be or be not fair to perpetuate them, there is no doubt that the wrong impressions of musicians about each other would make an amusing collection for the cynical student of the artistic temperament. Nowhere could a richer crop of such mistakes be collected than in M. Modeste Tchaikovsky's life of his distinguished brother, who seems to have been constitutionally incapable of judging any other man's music. Excepting that his admiration of Mozart knew no bounds, and that he liked Bizet's 'Carmen,' there is scarcely a figure in ancient or modern music his verdict about whom has not been reversed by the generality of those who have the best right to an opinion. Here was a typical Romantic in the narrowest sense. Shy, introspective, sensitive to the degree of absurdity, he embarked on marriage without any very strong impulse, and, to make up for the failure of the experiment, started an ardent friendship with a rich lady with whom he never interchanged a word of actual speech. She gave over for his use a house and grounds, and made him an annual allowance; but, out of respect for his wish that his ideal should not be broken, she consented never to meet him. When an accident brought them face to face they uttered no word, and ignored one another. The circumstances which attended the withdrawal of the allowance give a really tragic picture of hypersensitiveness; though purely business

reasons compelled his benefactress to discontinue her gift, the incident was morbidly interpreted by Tchaikovsky as indicating a wish on her part that their intimate friendship should come to an end.

The poor lady's state of mind receives little sympathy from the composer's biographer. Had the thing happened to any but a professed Romantic, it would have hardly been accepted as the tragedy of his life; for any ordinary person would have seen the possibility of the reason alleged being actually the true one, and the matter would have been easily cleared up. However, if this had happened, we might have lost the 'Pathetic' symphony; so the incident is not entirely to be deplored. The book, apart from these unfortunate events, is a very sad record of a life spoilt by a disposition of the most uncomfortable kind; the troubles which occupy so large a space in it were partly due to health; and indeed it might easily be maintained that the gloomy atmosphere which surrounds Russian art of all kinds is simply due to the unwholesome nature of the food that Russians enjoy, and to their abhorrence of open air.

We seem to be passing through a stage of musical art in which form and beauty of design are at a discount, and a claim is set up for every composer, past or present, that he is, or was, a Romantic. 'Classicism' is sneered at and labelled 'academic.' Every departure from rule, whether made of set purpose or from mere incapacity to comply with it, is hailed with delight as a sign of vitality and of the fashionable romantic disposition. It is amusing to see how far the lovers of romance have gone in order to support their contention in the case of the older composers. M. Albert Schweitzer, the author of 'J. S. Bach, le Musicien-Poète,' claims that Bach's romanticism was displayed in certain puerilities which the truer admirers of the master will find great difficulty in accepting as intentional. That he often put some quaint touch of realism into even solemn passages of his music has been long recognised; the cock-crowing in both settings of the 'Passion' is an instance that will occur to every one. But that the same sort of thing was carried out on a scale as large as M. Schweitzer supposes is almost incredible. In the cantata, 'Sehet, wir geh'n hinauf gen Jerusalem,' the introduction is built on a rising scale

followed by the descent of a seventh ; this, we are gravely informed, portrays Christ and His disciples going slowly up the hill ; and the downward interval is intended to suggest ' *Jésus qui s'arrête et qui se retourne vers ses disciples pour leur annoncer qu'il marche vers la mort.*'

There are many similar instances of puerile analysis all evidently intended to produce the impression that Bach was a kind of Richard Strauss born before the time. What the writer does not see is that Bach was indeed a Romantic, but in the truest, widest sense ; not a manipulator of childish trivialities, but a great creator moved by the passion for emotional beauty which lies at the root of Classical art just as truly as at that of Romantic. In the art of taking suggestions from outside Bach was of course a supreme master. One of his favourite themes, treated in several of the cantatas, and especially in one of peculiar beauty devoted to that theme alone—' *Schlage doch, gewünschte Stunde*'—is that of the faithful soul longing to hear the knell of death ; in ' *Schlage doch*' two bells are actually employed ; and the whole cantata ends with a soft dying-away of the bell's vibrations without other accompaniment of any kind. In ' *Liebster Gott, wann werd' ich sterben*' the same idea is carried out almost as poetically ; and in many another way Bach shows himself a true Romantic, even taking the narrow view of the term.

But is this narrow view of the word the right one ? Does it not lead to a habit of classifying things in arbitrary divisions which, it is manifest, do not fulfil their purpose, since the best things are both classical and romantic, and the worst neither one nor the other ? Surely the impulse to artistic creation is the secret of romance ; it is the passionate longing to get away from sordid matters of earth into a world of the imagination that constitutes romance ; and this passionate desire is surely quite as strongly developed in those who prefer to express themselves in established forms as it is in those who are always eager to strike out new forms for themselves. It is a striking consideration, but one of which the detailed exposition would take us too far from the main point, that none of the very greatest of composers has been a pioneer in regard to forms ; one and all of the

few whom all mankind agrees to regard as supreme have accepted the forms they found ready to their hands, and have given them new vitality by casting their original thoughts into them. It has been always the men of secondary rank who have struck out new paths, possibly finding themselves cramped by the old forms, or unable to comply successfully with the rules of the established patterns. Putting Wagner for the moment on one side, since his art was not purely musical, Palestrina, Bach, Handel, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and Brahms did nothing in the way of making new forms. With all these composers the old were enough for their purpose; for their wealth of expression was too genuine, too fresh, to be hampered by the forms that were ready, and it was not their business to frame new receptacles for the ideas that poured in upon them.

The form-makers are the men of secondary attainments. Monteverde and his fellows made the form for Alessandro Scarlatti to fill; Emanuel Bach lit, as though by accident, upon the greatest form of all, which was to be supreme in music from Haydn's time to that of Brahms; in a smaller way Field invented the nocturne form, in which his own creations are forgotten besides those of his follower, Chopin; and Liszt's experiments in form, whether successful or not, are the latest alterations of the established patterns. But in every age all the great men have been moved by a kindred desire to create something that shall make permanent the inner vision of beauty that has been granted to them; and all are of the Romantic race in the truest sense. It is of course undeniable that, side by side with these great men, who are at once Romantic in their own dispositions and Classical in their ultimate destination, there grow and flourish men who think of nothing but how to turn to account the artistic innovations of the better men; how to make a fortune out of whatever kind of music may be in fashion at the moment. These, the purveyors in a past generation of trumpery and conventional operas, of dull sonatas, of pianoforte fantasias and *pot-pourris*, of flimsy anthems, and, in short, of all that Wagner called 'Kapellmeistermusik,' are always with us. At the present moment it would seem that they are engaged in turning out the most hideous and meaningless succes-

sions of cacophonous notes, hoping to delude the modern critics into accepting them as satisfactory followers of the school that eschews melody as a thing of the past. These men would fain be called Romantics; but, although the men they copy may have the Romantic impulse, and may, as a consequence, become Classics hereafter, there is no place for the deliberate imitator in either of the classes we have been investigating.

Surely it would be hard to devise a rougher or less accurate definition of 'romanticism' than that which is now practically accepted, and which classes as Romantics the men who label their music, taking suggestions as to titles from anywhere in nature, art, or literature. Such suggestions, as we have already pointed out, may have been taken quite as deliberately and consciously by writers who prefer not to call their pieces by fancy names, or who take it to be the highest function of the creative artist to create, rather than to reflect impressions imperfectly assimilated. The greatest creators of music have not often chosen to divulge the source of their inspiration; and, in some of the most conspicuous of all we are left quite in the dark as to their processes of invention. If we look a little closely into the matter we shall see that the creative act seems at first to be confined to the invention of a musical subject or phrase which will yield the finest results when submitted to the process known as development. To take an analogy from literature, the initial phrase is like the dramatist's first conception of a character. His thoughts may have taken some suggestion from outside; but he has consciously or unconsciously transmuted that suggestion into something much more his own than a mere reflection of some one else's idea expressed in terms of a different art. The four notes which are the main subject of the first movement of the 'C minor' symphony of Beethoven do not of themselves strike us as being particularly pregnant with meaning until we know the whole movement; so, when we see the wife of the Thane of Fife reading a letter from her husband, there is nothing at first to tell us that here is an absolute creation, something infinitely beyond the chronicles in which the first suggestion may have been found. It is the magic of Shakespeare's art that makes Lady Macbeth what she is; and the four notes of the

'C minor' become what they are through the process of development to which Beethoven has submitted them.

This analogy may be carried farther and more generally applied. The chief reason why many of the truest lovers of music do not like 'programme music' is that they are in the habit of accepting musical phrases or themes as having so strong an individuality of their own that they become exactly like characters in a book or play—not reflections of this or that character, but so instinct with life that they stand on their own feet. Now, to be told, 'this subject or theme means a witch,' 'this is a fairy,' or the like, must, in the nature of things, take away from any independence, any individuality, which the music may possess; and those who have been following the course of what we may call the musical drama (meaning thereby solely the adventures of the musical themes, their alternation, final union, and action and reaction upon one another) are suddenly recalled to the scheme of tangible things by being required to identify such and such a theme with such and such a personage in a story. The sensations aroused by such music are not unlike the deadening feeling that used to come over some of us when we were told that the story of Persephone was an allegory of the return of spring. So it may have been, but why spoil the story by telling us so? Many listeners to the 'C minor' symphony, or even to the 'Pathetic' symphony of Tchaikovsky, are truly thankful as they listen that the composers did not tack on some narrative to each work to spoil its truly romantic effect. Perhaps some day a more scientific definition of art will be accepted; and we shall refuse the epithet 'romantic' to anything which appears under the cover of a definite story. A system of classification such as that we have been examining takes a very long time to destroy, for, however fallacious it may be, it is convenient; but destroyed it will be, and the scientific definition will take its place.

Art. IV.—HENRIK IBSEN.

1. *The Works of Henrik Ibsen*. Eleven vols. Revised and edited by William Archer. London: Heinemann, 1906. (In course of publication.)
2. *Ibsen's Prose Dramas*. Edited by William Archer. Five vols. London: Walter Scott, *n.d.*
3. *Peer Gynt*. Authorised translation by William and Charles Archer. London: Walter Scott, *n.d.*
4. *The Master-builder*. Translated by Edmund Gosse and William Archer. London: Heinemann, 1893.
5. *Little Eyolf* (1895); *John Gabriel Borkman* (1897); *When we Dead Awaken* (1900). Translated by William Archer. Same publisher.
6. *Brand*. Translated by C. H. Herford. Same publisher, 1894.
7. *Love's Comedy*. Translated by C. H. Herford. London: Duckworth, 1900.
8. *The Correspondence of Henrik Ibsen*. Edited by Mary Morison. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1905.
9. *Henrik Ibsen. Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson. Critical Studies*. By George Brandes. London: Heinemann, 1899.

'EVERYTHING which I have created as a poet,' Ibsen said in a letter, 'has had its origin in a frame of mind and a situation in life; I never wrote because I had, as they say, found a good subject.' Yet his chief aim as a dramatist has been to set character in independent action, and to stand aside, reserving his judgment. 'The method, the technique of the construction,' he says, speaking of what is probably his masterpiece, 'Ghosts,' 'in itself entirely precludes the author's appearing in the speeches. My intention was to produce the impression in the mind of the reader that he was witnessing something real.' That, at his moment of most perfect balance, was his intention; that was what he achieved in an astonishing way. But his whole life was a development; and we see him moving from point to point, deliberately, and yet inevitably; reaching the goal which it was his triumph to reach, and then going beyond the goal, because movement in any direction, was a necessity of his nature.

In Ibsen's letters we shall find invaluable help in the study of this character and this development. The man

shows himself in them with none the less disguise because he shows himself unwillingly. In these hard, crabbed, formal, painfully truthful letters we see the whole narrow, precise, and fanatical soul of this Puritan of art, who sacrificed himself, his family, his friends, and his country to an artistic sense of duty only to be paralleled among those religious people whom he hated and resembled.

His creed, as man and as artist, was the cultivation, the realisation of self. In quite another sense that, too, was the creed of Nietzsche; but what in Nietzsche was pride, the pride of individual energy, in Ibsen was a kind of humility, or a practical deduction from the fact that only by giving complete expression to oneself can one produce the finest work. Duty to oneself: that was how he looked upon it; and though, in a letter to Björnson, he affirmed, as the highest praise, 'his life was his best work,' to himself it was the building-up of the artist in him that he chiefly cared for. And to this he set himself with a moral fervour and a scientific tenacity. There was in Ibsen none of the abundance of great natures, none of the ease of strength. He nursed his force, as a miser hoards his gold; and does he not give you at times an uneasy feeling that he is making the most of himself, as the miser makes the most of his gold by scraping up every farthing?

'The great thing,' he says in a letter of advice, 'is to hedge about what is one's own, to keep it free and clear from everything outside that has no connexion with it.' He bids Brandes cultivate 'a genuine, full-blooded egoism, which shall force you for a time to regard what concerns you as the only thing of any consequence, and everything else as non-existent.' Yet he goes on to talk about 'benefiting society,' is conscious of the weight which such a conviction or compromise lays upon him, and yet cannot get rid of the burden, as Nietzsche does. He has less courage than Nietzsche, though no less logic, and is held back from a complete realisation of his own doctrine because he has so much worldly wisdom and is so anxious to make the best of all worlds.

'In every new poem or play,' he writes, 'I have aimed at my own personal spiritual emancipation and purification, for a man shares the responsibility and the guilt of the society to which he belongs.' This queer entangle-

ment in social bonds on the part of one whose main endeavour had always been to free the individual from the conventions and restrictions of society is one of those signs of parochialism which peep out in Ibsen again and again. 'The strongest man,' he says in a letter, anticipating the epilogue of one of his plays, 'is he who stands alone.' But Ibsen did not find it easy to stand alone, though he found pleasure in standing aloof. The influence of his environment upon him is marked from the first. He breaks with his father and mother, never writes to them or goes back to see them; partly because he feels it necessary to avoid contact with 'certain tendencies prevailing there.' 'Friends are an expensive luxury,' he finds, because they keep him from doing what he wishes to do, out of consideration for them. Is not this intellectual sensitiveness the corollary of a practical cold-heartedness? He cannot live in Norway because, he says, 'I could never lead a consistent spiritual life there.' In Norway he finds that 'the accumulation of small details makes the soul small.' How curious an admission for an individualist, for an artist! He goes to Rome, and feels that he has discovered a new mental world. 'After I had been in Italy I could not understand how I had been able to exist before I had been there.' Yet before long he must go on to Munich, because 'here one is too entirely out of touch with the movements of the day.'

He insists, again and again: 'Environment has a great influence upon the forms in which the imagination creates'; and, in a tone of half-burlesque, but with something serious in his meaning, he declares that wine had something to do with the exaltation of 'Brand' and 'Peer Gynt,' and sausages and beer with the satirical analysis of 'The League of Youth.' And he adds: 'I do not intend by this to place the last-mentioned play on a lower level. I only mean that my point of view has changed, because here I am in a community well ordered even to weariness.' He says elsewhere that he could only have written 'Peer Gynt' where he wrote it, at Ischia and Sorrento, because it is 'written without regard to consequences—as I only dare to write far away from home.' If we trace him through his work we shall see him, with a strange docility, allowing not only 'frame of mind and situation in life,' but his actual surroundings, to mould his work,

alike in form and in substance. If he had never left Norway he might have written verse to the end of his life; if he had not lived in Germany, where there is 'up-to-date civilisation to study,' he would certainly never have written the social dramas; if he had not returned to Norway at the end of his life, the last plays would not have been what they were. I am taking him at his word: but Ibsen is a man who must be taken at his word.

What is perhaps most individual in the point of view of Ibsen in his dramas is his sense of the vast importance of trifles, of the natural human tendency to invent or magnify misunderstandings. A misunderstanding is his main lever of the tragic mischief; and he has studied and diagnosed this unconscious agent of destiny more minutely and persistently than any other dramatist. He found it in himself. We see just this brooding over trifles, this sensitiveness to wrongs, imaginary or insignificant, in the revealing pages of his letters. It made the satirist of his earlier years; it made him a satirist of non-essentials. A criticism of one of his books sets him talking of wide vengeance; and he admitted in later life that he said to himself, 'I am ruined,' because a newspaper had attacked him overnight.

With all his desire to 'undermine the idea of the State,' he besieges king and government with petitions for money; and he will confess in a letter, 'I should very much like to write publicly about the mean behaviour of the Government,' which, however, he refrains from doing. He gets sore and angry over party and parochial rights and wrongs, even when he is far away from them, and has congratulated himself on the calming and enlightening effect of distance. A Norwegian bookseller threatens to pirate one of his books, and he makes a national matter of it. 'If,' he says, 'this dishonest speculation really obtains sympathy and support at home, it is my intention, come what may, to sever all ties with Norway and never set foot on her soil again.' How petty, how like a hysterical woman that is. How, in its way of taking a possible trifling personal injustice as if it were a thing of vital and even national moment, he betrays what was always to remain narrow, as well as bitter, in the centre of his being! He has recorded it

against himself (for he spared himself, as he proudly and truthfully said, no more than others) in an anecdote which is a profound symbol.

'During the time I was writing "Brand," I had on my desk a glass with a scorpion in it. From time to time the little animal was ill. Then I used to give it a piece of soft fruit, upon which it fell furiously and emptied its poison into it—after which it was well again. Does not something of the kind happen with us poets?' he adds.

Poets, no; but in Ibsen there is always some likeness of the sick scorpion in the glass.

In one of his early letters to Björnson, he had written: 'When I read the news from home, when I gaze upon all that respectable, estimable narrow-mindedness and worldliness, it is with the feeling of an insane man staring at one single, hopelessly dark spot.' All his life Ibsen gazed until he found the black spot somewhere; but it was with less and less of this angry, reforming feeling of the insane man. He saw the black spot at the core of the earth's fruit, of the whole apple of the earth; and as he became more hopeless, he became less angry; he learned something of the supreme indifference of art. He had learned much when he came to realise that, in the struggle for liberty, it was chiefly the energy of the struggle that mattered. 'He who possesses liberty,' he said, 'otherwise than as a thing to be striven for, possesses it dead and soulless. . . . So that a man who stops in the midst of the struggle and says, "Now I have it," thereby shows that he has lost it.' He had learned still more when he could add to his saying, 'The minority is always right,' this subtle corollary, that a fighter in the intellectual vanguard can never collect a majority around him. 'At the point where I stood when I wrote each of my books, there now stands a tolerably compact crowd; but I myself am no longer there; I am elsewhere; farther ahead, I hope.' 'That man is right,' he thought, 'who has allied himself most closely with the future.' The future, to Ibsen, was a palpable thing, not concerned merely with himself as an individual, but a constantly removing, continually occupied promised land, into which he was not content to go alone. Yet he would always have asked of a follower, with Zarathustra: 'This is my road;

which is yours?' His future was to be peopled by great individuals.

It was in seeking to find himself that Ibsen sought to find truth; and truth he knew was to be found only within him. The truth which he sought for himself was not at all truth in the abstract, but a truth literally 'efficacious,' and able to work out the purpose of his existence. That purpose he never doubted. The work he had to do was the work of an artist, and to this everything must be subservient. 'The great thing is to become honest and truthful in dealing with oneself—not to determine to do this or determine to do that, but to do what one *must* do because one is oneself. All the rest simply leads to falsehood.' He 'conceives of truth as being above all clear-sighted, and the approach to truth as a matter largely of will. No preacher of God and of righteousness and the kingdom to come was ever more centred, more convinced, more impregably minded every time that he has absorbed a new idea or is constructing a new work of art. His conception of art often changes; but he never deviates at any one time from any one conception. There is something narrow as well as something intense in this certainty, this calmness, this moral attitude towards art. Nowhere has he expressed more of himself than in a letter to a woman who had written some kind of religious sequel to 'Brand.' He tells her:

"'Brand' is an æsthetic work, pure and simple. What it may have demolished or built up is a matter of absolute indifference to me. It came into being as the result of something which I had, not observed, but experienced; it was a necessity for me to free myself from something which my inner man had done with, by giving poetic form to it; and, when by this means I had got rid of it, my book had no longer any interest for me.'

It is in the same positive, dogmatic way that he assures us that 'Peer Gynt' is a poem, not a satire; 'The League of Youth' a 'simple comedy and nothing more'; 'Emperor and Galilean' an 'entirely realistic work'; that in 'Ghosts' 'there is not a single opinion, a single utterance, which can be laid to the account of the author. . . . My intention was to produce the impression in the mind of the reader that he was witnessing something real. . . .

It preaches nothing at all.' Of 'Hedda Gabler' he says: 'It was not really my desire to deal in this play with so-called problems. What I principally wanted to do was to depict human beings, human emotions, and human destinies, upon a groundwork of the social conditions and principles of the present day,' 'My chief life-task,' he defines: 'to depict human characters and human destinies.'

Ibsen's development has always lain chiefly in the perfecting of his tools. From the beginning he has had certain ideas, certain tendencies, a certain consciousness of things to express; he has been haunted, as only creative artists are haunted, by a world waiting to be born; and, from the beginning, he has built on a basis of criticism, a criticism of life. Part of his strength has gone out in fighting: he has had the sense of a mission. Part of his strength has gone out in the attempt to fly: he has had the impulse, without the wings, of the poet. And, when he has been content to leave fighting and flying alone, and to build solidly on a solid foundation, it is then that he has achieved his great work. But he has never been satisfied, or never been able, to go on doing just that work, his own work; and the poet in him, the impotent poet who is full of a sense of what poetry is, but is never able, for more than a moment, to create poetry, has come whispering in the ear of the man of science, who is the new, unerring artist, the maker of a wonderful new art of prose, and has made him uneasy, and given uncertainty to his hand. The master-builder has altered his design, he has set up a tower here, 'too high for a dwelling-house,' and added a window there, with the stained glass of a church window, and fastened on ornaments in stucco, breaking the severe line of the original design.

In Ibsen science has made its great stand against poetry; and the Germans have come worshipping, saying, 'Here, in our era of marvellously realistic politics, we have come upon correspondingly realistic poetry. . . . We received from it the first idea of a possible new poetic world. . . . We were adherents of this new school of realistic art: we had found our æsthetic creed.' But the maker of this creed, the creator of this school of realistic

art, was not able to be content with what he had done, though this was the greatest thing he was able to do. It is with true insight that he boasts, in one of his letters, of what he can do 'if I am only careful to do what I am quite capable of, namely, combine this relentlessness of mind with deliberateness in the choice of means.' There lay his success: deliberateness in the choice of means for the doing of a given thing, the thing for which his best energies best fitted him. Yet it took him forty years to discover exactly what those means to that end were; and then the experimenting impulse, the sense of what poetry is, was soon to begin its disintegrating work. Science, which seemed to have conquered poetry, was to pay homage to poetry.

Ibsen comes before us as a man of science who would have liked to be a poet; or who, half-equipped as a poet, is halved or hampered by the scientific spirit until he realises that he is essentially a man of science. From the first his aim was to express himself; and it was a long time before he realised that verse was not his native language. His first three plays were in verse, the fourth in verse alternating with prose; then came two plays, historic and legendary, written in more or less archaic prose; then a satire in verse, 'Love's Comedy,' in which there is the first hint of the social dramas; then another prose play, the nearest approach that he ever made to poetry, but written in prose, 'The Pretenders'; and then the two latest and most famous of the poems, 'Brand' and 'Peer Gynt.' After this, verse is laid aside, and at last we find him condemning it, and declaring 'it is improbable that verse will be employed to any extent worth mentioning in the drama of the immediate future. . . . It is therefore doomed.' But the doom was Ibsen's: to be a great prose dramatist, and only the segment of a poet.

Nothing is more interesting than to study Ibsen's verse in the making. His sincerity to his innermost aim, the aim at the expression of himself, is seen in his refusal from the beginning to accept any poetic convention, to limit himself in poetic subject, to sift his material or clarify his metre. He has always insisted on producing something personal, thoughtful, fantastic, and essentially prosaic; and it is in a vain protest against the nature of things that he writes of 'Peer Gynt,' 'My book is poetry;

and if it is not, then it will be. The conception of poetry in our country, in Norway, shall be made to conform to the book.' His verse was the assertion of his individuality at all costs; it was a costly tool, which he cast aside only when he found that it would not carve every material.

Ibsen's earliest work in verse has not been translated. Dr Brandes tells us that it followed Danish models, the sagas, and the national ballads. In the prose play, 'Lady Inger of Östraat,' we see the dramatist, the clever playwright, still holding on to the skirts of romance, and ready with rhetoric enough on occasion, but more concerned with plot and stage effect than with even what is interesting in the psychology of the characters. 'The Vikings,' also in prose, is a piece of strong grappling with a heroic subject, with better rhetoric, and some good poetry taken straight out of the sagas, with fervour in it, and gravity; yet an experiment only, a thing not made wholly personal, nor wholly achieved. It shows how well Ibsen could do work which was not his work. In 'Love's Comedy,' a modern play in verse, he is already himself. Point of view is there; materials are there; the man of science has already laid his hand upon the poet. We are told that Ibsen tried to write it in prose, failed, and fell back upon verse. It is quite likely; he has already an accomplished technique, and can put his thoughts into verse with admirable skill. But the thoughts are not born in verse, and, brilliantly rhymed as they are, they do not make poetry.

Dr Brandes admits everything that can be said against Ibsen as a poet when he says, speaking of this play and of 'Brand':

'Even if the ideas they express have not previously found utterance in poetry, they have done so in prose literature. In other words, these poems do not set forth new thoughts, but translate into metre and rhyme thoughts already expressed.

'Love's Comedy' is a criticism of life; it is full of hard, scientific, prose thought about conduct, which has its own quality as long as it sticks to fact and remains satire; but when the prose curvets and tries to lift, when criticism turns constructive, we find no more than bubbles and children's balloons, empty and coloured, that soar and

evaporate. There is, in this farce of the intellect, a beginning of social drama; realism peeps through the artificial point and polish of a verse which has some of the qualities of Pope and some of the qualities of Swift; but the dramatist is still content that his puppets shall have the air of puppets; he stands in the arena of his circus and cracks his whip; they gallop round grimacing, and with labels on their backs. The verse comes between him and nature, as the satire comes between him and poetry. Cynicism has gone to the making of poetry more than once, but only under certain conditions: that the poet should be a lyric poet, like Heine, or a great personality in action, like Byron, to whom cynicism should be but one of the tones of his speech, the gestures of his attitude. With Ibsen it is a petty anger, an anger against nature, and it leads to a transcendentalism which is empty and outside nature.

The criticism of love, so far as it goes beyond what is amusing and Gilbertian, is the statement of a kind of arid soul-culture more sterile than that of any cloister, the soul-culture of the scientist who thinks he has found out, and can master, the soul. It is a new asceticism, a denial of nature, a suicide of the senses which may lead to some literal suicide such as that in 'Rosmersholm,' or may feed the brain on some air unbreathable by the body, as in 'When we Dead Awaken.' It is the old idea of self-sacrifice creeping back under cover of a new idea of self-intensification; and it comes, like asceticism, from a contempt of nature, a distrust of nature, an abstract intellectual criticism of nature.

Out of such material no poetry will ever come; and none has come in 'Love's Comedy.' In the prose play which followed, 'The Pretenders,' which is the dramatisation of an inner problem in the form of an historical drama, there is a much nearer approach to poetry. The stage-craft is still too obvious; effect follows effect like thunder-claps; there is melodrama in the tragedy; but the play is, above all, the working-out of a few deep ideas, and in these ideas there is both beauty and wisdom.

It was with the publication of 'Brand' that Ibsen became famous, not only in his own country, but throughout Europe. The poem has been seriously compared,

even in England, with 'Hamlet'; even in Germany, with 'Faust.' A better comparison is that which Mr Gosse has made with Sidney Dobell's 'Balder.' It is full of satire and common-sense, of which there is little enough in 'Balder'; but not 'Balder' is more abstract, or more inhuman in its action. Types, not people, move in it; their speech is doctrine, not utterance; it is rather a tract than a poem. The technique of the verse, if we can judge it from the brilliant translation of Prof. Herford, which reads almost everywhere like an original, is more than sufficient for its purpose; all this argumentative and abstract and realistic material finds adequate expression in a verse which has aptly been compared with the verse of Browning's 'Christmas-eve and Easter-day.' The comparison may be carried farther, and it is disastrous to Ibsen. Browning deals with hard matter, and can be boisterous; but he is never, as Ibsen is always, pedestrian. The poet, though, like St Michael, he carry a sword, must, like St Michael, have wings. Ibsen has no wings.

But there is another comparison by which I think we can determine more precisely the station and quality of 'Brand' as poetry. Take any one of the vigorous and vivid statements of dogma, which are the very kernel of the poem, and compare them with a few lines from Blake's 'Everlasting Gospel.' There every line, with all its fighting force, is pure poetry; it was conceived as poetry, born as poetry, and can be changed into no other substance. Here we find a vigorous technique fitting striking thought into good swinging verse, with abundance of apt metaphor; but where is the vision, the essence, which distinguishes it from what, written in prose, would have lost nothing? Ibsen writes out of the intellect, adding fancy and emotion as he goes; but in Blake every line leaps forth like lightning from a cloud.

The motto of Brand was 'all or nothing'; that of 'Peer Gynt' 'to be master of the situation.' Both are studies of egoism, in the finding and losing of self; both are personal studies and national lessons. Of 'Peer Gynt' Ibsen said, 'I meant it to be a caprice.' It is Ibsen in high spirits; and it is like a mute dancing at a funeral. It is a harlequin of a poem, a thing of threads and patches; and there are gold threads in it and tattered clouts. It is an experiment which has hardly succeeded,

because it is not one but a score of experiments. It is made up of two elements, an element of folklore and an element of satire. The first comes and goes for the most part with Peer and his mother; and all this brings Norwegian soil with it, and is alive. The satire is fierce, local, and fantastic. Out of the two comes a clashing thing which may itself suggest, as has been said, the immense contrast between Norwegian summer, which is day, and winter, which is night. Grieg's music, childish, mumbling, singing, leaping, and sombre, has aptly illustrated it. It was a thing done on a holiday, for a holiday. It was of this that Ibsen said he could not have written it any nearer home than Ischia and Sorrento. But is it, for all its splendid scraps and patches, a single masterpiece? is it, above all, a poem? The idea, certainly, is one and coherent; every scene is an illustration of that idea; but is it born of that idea? Is it, more than once or twice, inevitable? What touches at times upon poetry is the folk element; the irony at times has poetic substance in it; but this glimmer of poetic substance, which comes and goes, is lost for the most part among mists and vapours, and under artificial light. That poet which exists somewhere in Ibsen, rarely quite out of sight, never wholly at liberty, comes into this queer dance of ideas and humours, and gives it, certainly, the main value it has. But the 'state satirist' is always on the heels of the poet; and imagination, whenever it appears for a moment, is led away into bondage by the spirit of the fantastic, which is its prose equivalent or makeshift. It is the fantastic that Ibsen generally gives us in the place of imagination; and the fantastic is a kind of rhetoric, manufactured by the will, and has no place in poetry.

In 'The League of Youth' Ibsen takes finally the step which he had half taken in 'Love's Comedy.' 'In my new comedy,' he writes to Dr Brandes, 'you will find the common order of things—no strong emotions, no deep feelings, and, more particularly, no isolated thoughts.' He adds: 'It is written in prose, which gives it a strong realistic colouring. I have paid particular attention to form, and, among other things, I have accomplished the feat of doing without a single monologue, in fact without

a single "aside." The play is hardly more than a good farce; the form is no more than the slightest of advances towards probability on the strict lines of the Scribe tradition; the 'common order of things' is there, in subject, language, and in everything but the satirical intention which underlies the whole trivial, stupid, and no doubt life-like talk and action. Two elements are still in conflict, the photographic and the satirical; and the satirical is the only relief from the photographic. The stage mechanism is still obvious; but the intention, one sees clearly, is towards realism; and the play helps to get the mechanism in order.

After 'The League of Youth' Ibsen tells us that he tried to 'seek salvation in remoteness of subject'; so he returned to his old scheme for a play on Julian the Apostate, and wrote the two five-act plays which make up 'Emperor and Galilean.' He tells us that it is the first work which he wrote under German intellectual influences, and that it contains 'that positive theory of life which the critics have demanded of me so long.' In one letter he affirms that it is 'an entirely realistic work,' and in another, 'It is a part of my own spiritual life which I am putting into this book . . . and the historical subject chosen has a much more intimate connexion with the movements of our own time than one might at first imagine.' How great a relief it must have been, after the beer and sausages of 'The League of Youth,' to go back to an old cool wine, no one can read 'Emperor and Galilean' and doubt. It is a relief and an escape; and the sense of the stage has been put wholly on one side in both of these plays, of which the second reads almost like a parody of the first: the first so heated, so needlessly colloquial, the second so full of argumentative rhetoric. Ibsen has turned against his hero in the space between writing the one and the other; and the Julian of the second is more harshly satirised from within than ever 'Peer Gynt' was. In a letter to Dr Brandes, Ibsen says: 'What the book is or is not, I have no desire to enquire. I only know that I saw a fragment of humanity plainly before my eyes, and that I tried to reproduce what I saw.' But in the play itself this intention comes and goes; and, while some of it reminds one of 'Salammbô' in its attempt to treat

remote ages realistically, other parts are given up wholly to the exposition of theories, and yet others to a kind of spectacular romance, after the cheap method of George Ebers and the German writers of historical fiction. The satire is more serious, the criticism of ideas more fundamental than anything in 'The League of Youth'; but, as in almost the whole of Ibsen's more characteristic work up to this point, satire strives with realism; it is still satire, not irony, and is not yet, as the later irony is to be, a deepening, and thus a justification, of the realism.

Eight years passed between 'The League of Youth' and 'The Pillars of Society'; but they are both woven of the same texture. Realism has made for itself a firmer footing; the satire has more significance; the mechanism of the stage goes much more smoothly, though indeed to a more conventionally happy ending; melodrama has taken some of the place of satire. Yet the 'state-satirist' is still at his work, still concerned with society and bringing only a new detail of the old accusation against society. Like every play of this period, it is the unveiling of a lie. See yourselves as you are, the man of science seems to be saying to us. Here are your 'pillars of society'; they are the tools of society. Here is your happy marriage, and it is a doll's house. Here is your respected family, here is the precept of 'honour your father and your mother' in practice; and here is the little voice of heredity whispering, 'ghosts'! There is the lie of respectability, the lie hidden behind marriage, the lie which saps the very roots of the world.

Ibsen is no preacher, and he has told us expressly that 'Ghosts' 'preaches nothing at all.' This pursuit of truth to its most secret hiding-place is not a sermon against sin; it sets a scientific dogma visibly to work, and watches the effect of the hypothesis. As the dogma is terrible and plausible, and the logic of its working-out faultless, we get one of the deeper thrills that modern art has to give us. I would take 'A Doll's House,' 'Ghosts,' and 'The Wild Duck' as Ibsen's three central plays, the plays in which his method completely attained its end, in which his whole capacities are seen at their finest balance; and this work, this reality in which every word, meaningless in itself, is alive with suggestion, is the finest scientific work which has been done in literature. Into this

period comes his one buoyant play, 'An Enemy of the People,' his rebound against the traditional hypocrisy which had attacked 'Ghosts' for its telling of unseasonable truths; it is an allegory, in the form of journalism, or journalism in the form of allegory, and is the 'apology' of the man of science for his mission. Every play is a dissection, or a vivisection rather; for these people who suffer so helplessly, and are shown us so calmly in their agonies, are terribly alive. 'A Doll's House' is the first of Ibsen's plays in which the puppets have no visible wires. The playwright has perfected his art of illusion; beyond 'A Doll's House' and 'Ghosts' dramatic illusion has never gone. And the irony of the ideas that work these living puppets has now become their life-blood. It is the tragic irony of a playwright who is the greatest master of technique since Sophocles, but who is only the playwright in Sophocles, not the poet.

For this moment, the moment of his finest achievement, that fantastic element which was Ibsen's resource against the prose of fact is so sternly repressed that it seems to have left no trace behind. With 'The Wild Duck' fantasy comes back, but with a more precise and explicit symbolism, not yet disturbing the reality of things. Here the irony is more disinterested than even in 'Ghosts,' for it turns back on the reformer and shows us how tragic a muddle we may bring about in the pursuit of truth and in the name of our ideals. In each of the plays which follows we see the return and encroachment of symbolism, the poetic impulse crying for satisfaction and offering us ever new forms of the fantastic in place of any simple and sufficing gift of the imagination. The man of science has had his way, has fulfilled his aim, and is discontented with the limits within which he has fulfilled it. He would extend those limits; and at first it seems as if those limits are to be extended. But the exquisite pathos which humanises what is fantastic in 'The Wild Duck' passes, in 'Rosmersholm,' in which the problems of 'Love's Comedy' are worked out to their logical conclusion, into a form, not of genuine tragedy, but of mental melodrama. In 'The Lady from the Sea,' how far is the symbol which has eaten up reality really symbol? Is it not rather the work of the intelligence than of the imagination? Is it not allegory intruding

into reality, disturbing that reality and giving us no spiritual reality in its place?

'Hedda Gabler' is closer to life; and Ibsen said about it in a letter:

'It was not really my desire to deal in this play with so-called problems. What I principally wanted to do was to depict human beings, human emotions, and human destinies upon a groundwork of certain of the social conditions and principles of the present day.'

The play might be taken for a study in that particular kind of 'decadence' which has come to its perfection in uncivilised and overcivilised Russia; and the woman whom Ibsen studied as his model was actually half-Russian. Eleonora Duse has created Hedda over again, as a poet would have created her, and has made a wonderful creature whom Ibsen never conceived, or at least never rendered. Ibsen has tried to add his poetry by way of ornament, and gives us a trivial and inarticulate poet about whom float certain catchwords. Here the chief catchword is 'vine-leaves in the hair'; in 'The Master-builder' it is 'harps in the air'; in 'Little Eyolf' it takes human form and becomes the Rat-wife; in 'John Gabriel Borkman' it drops to the tag of 'a dead man and two shadows'; in 'When we Dead Awaken' there is nothing but icy allegory. All that queer excitement of 'The Master-builder,' that 'ideal' awake again, is it not really a desire to open one's door to the younger generation? But is it the younger generation that finds itself at home there? is it not rather 'Peer Gynt' back again, and the ride through the air on the back of the reindeer?

In his earlier plays Ibsen had studied the diseases of society, and he had considered the individual only in his relation to society. Now he turns to study the diseases of the individual conscience. Only life interests him now, and only life feverishly alive; and the judicial irony has gone out of his scheme of things. The fantastic, experimental artist returns, now no longer external, but become morbidly curious. The man of science, groping after something outside science, reaches back, though with a certain uneasiness, to the nursery legend of the Rat-wife in 'Little Eyolf'; and the Rat-wife is neither reality nor imagination, neither Mother Bombie nor Macbeth's

witches, but the offspring of a supernaturalism that does not believe in itself. In 'John Gabriel Borkman,' which is the culmination of Ibsen's skill in construction, a play in four acts with only the pause of a minute between each, he is no longer content to concern himself with the old material, lies or misunderstandings, the irony of things happening as they do; but will have fierce hatreds, and a kind of incipient madness in things. In 'When we Dead Awaken,' all the people are quite consciously insane, and act a kind of charade with perfectly solemn faces, and a visible effort to look their parts.

In these last plays, with their many splendid qualities, not bound together and concentrated as in 'Ghosts,' we see the revenge of the imagination upon the realist, who has come to be no longer interested in the action of society upon the individual, but in the individual as a soul to be lost or saved. The man of science has discovered the soul, and does not altogether know what to do with it. He has settled its limits, set it to work in space and time, laid bare some of its secrets, shown its 'physical basis.' And now certain eccentricities in it begin to beckon to him; he would follow the soul into the darkness, but it is dark to him; he can but strain after it as it flutters. In the preface to the collected edition of his plays, published in 1901, Maeterlinck has pointed out, as one still standing at the cross-roads might point out to those who have followed him so far on his way, the great uncertainty in which the poet, the dramatist of to-day, finds himself, as what seems to be known or conjectured of 'the laws of Nature' is forced upon him, making the old, magnificently dramatic opportunities of the ideas of fate, of eternal justice, no longer possible for him to use.

'Le poète dramatique est obligé de faire descendre dans la vie réelle, dans la vie de tous les jours, l'idée qu'il se fait de l'inconnu. Il faut qu'il nous montre de quelle façon, sous quelle forme, dans quelles conditions, d'après quelles lois, à quelle fin, agissent sur nos destinées les puissances supérieures, les influences inintelligibles, les principes infinis, dont, en tant que poète, il est persuadé que l'univers est plein. Et comme il est arrivé à une heure où loyalement il lui est à peu près impossible d'admettre les anciennes, et où celles qui les doivent remplacer ne sont pas encore déterminées, n'ont pas encore de nom, il hésite, tâtonne, et s'il veut rester absolument sincère,

il n'ose plus se risquer hors de la réalité immédiate. Il se borne à étudier les sentiments humains dans leurs effets matériels et psychologiques.'

So long as Ibsen does this, he achieves great and solid things; and in 'Ghosts' a scientific dogma, the law or theory of heredity, has for once taken the place of Fate, and almost persuaded us that science, if it takes poetry from us, can restore to us a kind of poetry. But, as Maeterlinck has seen, as it is impossible not to see,

'quand Ibsen, dans d'autres drames, essaie de relier à d'autres mystères les gestes de ses hommes en mal de conscience exceptionnelle ou de ses femmes hallucinées, il faut convenir que, si l'atmosphère qu'il parvient à créer est étrange et troublante, elle est rarement saine et respirable, parce qu'elle est rarement raisonnable et réelle.'

From the time when, in 'A Doll's House,' Ibsen's puppets came to life, they have refused ever since to be put back into their boxes. The manager may play what tricks with them he pleases, but he cannot get them back into their boxes. They are alive, and they live with a weird, spectacular, but irrevocable life. But, after the last play of all, the dramatic epilogue, 'When we Dead Awaken,' the puppets have gone back into their boxes. Now they have come to obey the manager, and to make mysterious gestures which they do not understand, and to speak in images and take them for literal truths. Even their spectral life has gone out of them; they are rigid now, and only the strings set them dancing. The puppets had come to life, they had lived the actual life of the earth; and then a desire of the impossible, the desire of a life rarefied beyond human limits, took their human life from them, and they were puppets again. The epilogue to the plays is the apostasy of the man of science, and, as with all apostates, his new faith is not a vital thing; the poet was not really there to reawaken.

Before Ibsen the drama was a part of poetry; Ibsen has made it prose. All drama up to Ibsen had been romantic; Ibsen made it science. Until Ibsen no playwright had ever tried to imitate life on the stage, or even, as Ibsen does, to interpret it critically. The desire of every dramatist had been to create over again a more

abundant life, and to create it through poetry or through humour; through some form, that is, of the imagination. There was a time when Ibsen too would have made poetry of the drama; there was a time when verse seemed to him the only adequate form in which drama could be written. But his power to work in poetry was not equal to his desire to be a poet; and, when he revolted against verse and deliberately adopted as his material 'the common order of things,' when he set himself, for the first time in the history of the drama, to produce an illusion of reality rather than a translation or transfiguration of reality, he discovered his own strength, the special gift which he had brought into the world; but at the same time he set, for himself and for his age, his own limits to drama.

It is quite possible to write poetic drama in prose, though to use prose rather than verse is to write with the left hand rather than with the right. Before Ibsen, prose had been but a serving-maid to verse; and no great dramatist had ever put forward the prose conception of the drama. Shakespeare and the Elizabethans had used prose as an escape or a side-issue, for variety, or for the heightening of verse. Molière had used prose as the best makeshift for verse, because he was not himself a good craftsman in the art. And, along with the verse, and necessarily dependent upon it, there was the poetic, the romantic quality in drama. Think of those dramatists who seem to have least kinship with poetry; think, I will not say of Molière, but of Congreve. What is more romantic than 'The Way of the World'? But Ibsen extracts the romantic quality from drama as if it were a poison; and, in deciding to write realistically in prose, he gives up every aim but that which he defines, so early as 1874, as the wish 'to produce the impression on the reader that what he was reading was something that had really happened.' He is not even speaking of the effect in a theatre; he is defining his aim inside the covers of a book, his whole conception of drama.

The art of imitation has never been carried farther than it has been carried by Ibsen in his central plays; and with him, at his best, it is no mere imitation but a critical interpretation of life. How greatly this can be done, how greatly Ibsen has done it, there is 'Ghosts' to show us. Yet at what point this supreme criticism may

stop, what remains beyond it in the treatment of the vilest contemporary material, we shall see if we turn to a play which seems at first sight more grossly realistic than the most realistic play of Ibsen—Tolstoi's 'Powers of Darkness.' Though, as one reads or sees it, the pity and fear seem to weigh almost intolerably upon one, the impression left upon the mind when the reading or the performance is over, is that left by the hearing of noble and tragic music. How, out of such human discords, such a divine harmony can be woven I do not know; that is the secret of Tolstoi's genius, as it is the secret of the musician's. Here, achieved in terms of naked horror, we find some of the things which Maeterlinck has aimed at and never quite rendered through an atmosphere and through forms of vague beauty. And we find also another kind of achievement, by the side of which Ibsen's cunning adjustments of reality seem a little trivial or a little unreal. Here, for once, human life is islanded on the stage, a pin-point of light in an immense darkness; and the sense of that surrounding darkness is conveyed to us, as in no other modern play, by an awful sincerity and an unparalleled simplicity. Whether Tolstoi has learnt by instinct some stagecraft which playwrights have been toiling after in vain, or by what conscious and deliberate art he has supplemented instinct, I do not know. But, out of horror and humour, out of some creative abundance which has taken the dregs of human life up into itself and transfigured them by that pity which is understanding, by that faith which is creation, Tolstoi has in this play done what Ibsen has never done—given us an interpretation of life which owes nothing to science, nothing to the prose conception of life, but which, in spite of its form, is essential poetry.

Ibsen's concern is with character; and no playwright has created a more probable gallery of characters with whom we can become so easily and so completely familiar. They live before us, and with apparently so unconscious a self-revelation that we speculate about them as we would about real people, and sometimes take sides with them against their creator. Nora would, would not, have left her children! We know all their tricks of mind, their little differences from other people, their habits, the things that a novelist spends so much of his time in bringing

laboriously before us. Ibsen, in a single stage direction, gives you more than you would find in a chapter of a novel. His characters, when they are most themselves, are modern, of the day or moment; they are average, and represent nothing which we have not met with, nothing which astonishes us because it is of a nobility, a heroism, a wildness beyond our acquaintance. It is for this that he has been most praised; and there is something marvellous in the precision of his measurements of just so much and no more of the soul.

Yet there are no great characters in Ibsen; and do not great characters still exist? Ibsen's exceptional people never authenticate themselves as being greatly exceptional; their genius is vouched for on a report which they are themselves unable to confirm, as in the inarticulate poet Lövborg, or on their own assertion, as with John Gabriel Borkman, of whom even Dr Brandes admits, 'His own words do not convince me, for one, that he has ever possessed true genius.' When he is most himself, when he has the firmest hold on his material, Ibsen limits himself to that part of the soul which he and science know. By taking the average man as his hero, by having no hero, no villain, only probable levels, by limiting human nature to the bounds within which he can clinically examine it, he shirks, for the most part, the greatest crisis of the soul. Can the greatest drama be concerned with less than the ultimate issues of nature, the ultimate types of energy? with Lear and with *Cædipus*? The world of Shakespeare and of the Greeks is the world; it is universal, whether Falstaff blubbers in the tavern or Philoctetes cries in the cave. But the world which Ibsen really knows is that little segment of the world which we call society; its laws are not those of nature, its requirements are not the requirements of God or of man; it is a business association for the capture and division of profits; it is, in short, a fit subject for scientific study, but no longer a part of the material of poetry. The characteristic plays of Ibsen are rightly known as 'social dramas.' Their problem, for the main part, is no longer man in the world, but man in society. That is why they have no atmosphere, no background, but are carefully localised.

The rhythm of prose is physiological; the rhythm of

poetry is musical. There is in every play of Ibsen a rhythm perfect of its kind, but it is the physiological rhythm of prose. The rhythm of a play of Shakespeare speaks to the blood like wine or music; it is with exultation, with intoxication, that we see or read 'Antony and Cleopatra,' or even 'Richard II.' But the rhythm of a play of Ibsen is like that of a diagram in Euclid; it is the rhythm of logic, and it produces in us the purely mental exaltation of a problem solved. These people who are seen so clearly, moving about in a well-realised world, using probable words and doing necessary things, may owe some of their manner at least to the modern French stage, and to the pamphleteer's prose world of Dumas *fils*; yet, though they may illustrate problems, they no longer recite them. They are seen, not as the poet sees his people, naked against a great darkness, but clothed and contemporary, from the level of an ironical observer who sits in a corner of the same room. It is the doctor who sits there, watching his patients, and smiling ambiguously as he infers from his knowledge of their bodies what pranks their souls are likely to play.

If Ibsen gets no other kind of beauty, does he not get beauty of emotion? Or can there be beauty in an intensity of emotion which can be at least approached, in the power of thrilling, by an Adelphi melodrama? Is the speech of his people, when it is most nearly a revelation of the obscure forces outside us or within us, more than a stammering of those to whom unconsciousness does not lend distinction but intensifies idiosyncrasy? Drama, in its essence, requires no speech; it can be played by marionettes, or in dumb show, and be enthralling. But, speech once admitted, must not that speech, if it is to collaborate in supreme drama, be filled with imagination, be itself a beautiful thing? To Ibsen beauty has always been of the nature of an ornament, not an end. He would concentrate it into a catchword, repeated until it has lost all emotional significance. For the rest, his speech is the language of the newspaper, recorded with the fidelity of the phonograph. Its whole aim is at economy, as if economy were an end rather than a means.

Has not Ibsen, in the social dramas, tried to make poems without words? There is to be beauty of motive

and beauty of emotion; but the words are to be the plainest of all the plain words which we use in talking with one another, and nothing in them is to speak greatly when great occasions arise. Men's speech in great drama is as much higher than the words they would use in real life as their thoughts are higher than those words. It says the unuttered part of our speech. Ibsen would suppress all this heightening as he has suppressed the soliloquy and the aside. But here what he suppresses is not a convention but a means of interpretation. It is suppressing the essence for the sake of the accident.

Ibsen's genius for the invention of a situation has never been surpassed. More living characters than the characters of Ibsen have never moved on the stage. His women are at work now in the world, interpreting women to themselves, helping to make the women of the future. He has peopled a new world. But the inhabitants of this new world, before they begin to transgress its laws and so lose their own citizenship there, are so faithfully copied from the people about us that they share their dumbness, that dumbness to which it is the power and privilege of poetry to give speech. Given the character and the situation, what Ibsen asks at the moment of crisis is: What would this man be most likely to say? not, what would be the finest, the most deeply revealing thing that he could say? In that difference lies all the difference between prose and poetry.

ARTHUR SYMONS.

Art. V.—THE ETHICS OF HENRY SIDGWICK.

1. *Henry Sidgwick*. A Memoir. By A. S. and E. M. S. London : Macmillan, 1906.
 2. *The Methods of Ethics*. By H. Sidgwick. First edition. London : Macmillan, 1874. Sixth edition, 1901.
 3. *Principles of Political Economy*. By the same. First edition. London : Macmillan, 1883. Third edition, 1901.
 4. *The Elements of Politics*. By the same. First edition. London : Macmillan, 1891. Second edition, 1897.
 5. *Philosophy ; its Scope and Relations*. By the same. London : Macmillan, 1902.
 6. *Lectures on the Ethics of T. H. Green, Mr Herbert Spencer, and J. Martineau*. By the same. London : Macmillan, 1902.
 7. *The Development of European Polity*. By the same. London : Macmillan, 1903.
 8. *Miscellaneous Essays and Addresses*. By the same. London : Macmillan, 1904.
 9. *Lectures on the Philosophy of Kant, etc.* By the same. London : Macmillan, 1905.
- And other works.

UNIVERSITIES change quickly, but the gap which Sidgwick's death left in Cambridge is not filled, nor will it ever be filled for those who knew him. The recent appearance of his 'Life'—written with great ability, and giving a most vivid representation of his thought and work—affords an opportunity for an attempt to explain what he did, and—though this can never be done adequately—what he was.

His life was quiet and uneventful. He was born in 1838. After three years at Rugby he went up to Trinity in 1855. His undergraduate career was highly distinguished. He was Craven Scholar and Senior Classic, and also thirty-third Wrangler. It is a Cambridge tradition that he was told by his private tutor in mathematics that he might have been Senior Wrangler if he had chosen—that is, if he had given his chief attention to mathematics rather than to classics. In 1859 he was elected a Fellow of Trinity, and appointed an assistant tutor in classics. For some time he gave much of his leisure to Oriental

languages, but before long he had discovered that his main interest was in philosophy and economics, and he devoted himself entirely to these studies, in which he became college lecturer in 1867.

At this period all Fellows of colleges were bound on admission to declare themselves members of the Church of England. Sidgwick had felt no difficulty in doing this in 1859; but his views gradually changed, and in 1869 he felt it his duty to resign his fellowship. He retained, however, his college lectureship, and in 1881 was made an honorary Fellow. (In 1885, when the old restrictions had been removed, he was re-elected to a fellowship on the foundation.) In 1872 he stood unsuccessfully for the professorship of moral philosophy, to which he was elected in 1883. In 1876 he was married to Miss E. M. Balfour, now Principal of Newnham College.

After his election to the professorship no outward change took place in his life for many years. The chief events in it were his unsuccessful advocacy in 1891 of the abolition of compulsory Greek, and in 1897 of the opening of Cambridge degrees to women. In 1900 he resigned his professorship on finding that he was suffering from a mortal disease. He died on August 28 of that year.

It is difficult to write of a character and an activity which were so many-sided. The central point of his life, I think, was that he was above all things a student. Not that he ever forgot for a moment the claims which teaching had on him, but that he realised that here, as so often in life, a result is best attained by not aiming at it directly, and that a university teacher will impart knowledge all the more effectively if his chief ideal is not to impart it but to acquire it.

Certainly the great impression left by his lectures was that he regarded his pupils, down to the youngest, as fellow-students. This attitude, surely the true one in all university teaching, is especially important in the teaching of philosophy, where every result, except in the mere history of the subject, is controversial. Sidgwick never tried to force his own views on the members of his class. It was impossible to come away from his lectures without feeling that there were at least two sides to every philosophical question, and that each man must choose on his own responsibility. Above all he never fell into the snare

which has been fatal to so many teachers of philosophy: he never preached in the lecture-room. He sought for truth, and not for edification.

He took a prominent part in university business, especially in the organisation of all the changes which the new statutes of 1882 rendered necessary. In particular, the education of women at Cambridge owes more to him than to any other person. He was regarded as the leader of the progressive party in university matters, and, in addition to all the heavy labour which this sometimes involved, he did much ordinary administrative work on the Council of the Senate and the General Board of Studies.

The younger men who knew him used to regard a chance of hearing him talk as the greatest of social pleasures. His conversation would be difficult to describe, because, like all good conversation, it had no very marked features. It often turned on literature. He was a most constant novel-reader, remembered the novels he read with wonderful accuracy, and was always glad to talk about them. But we were best pleased when he began to speak of poetry, for then he would often begin to quote; and to hear him repeat poetry—especially Mr Swinburne's poetry—was not easily to be forgotten.

His interest in politics was always great, and his letters show how closely he followed their changes. He was a Liberal, and after 1886 a Liberal Unionist. Without any *a priori* objection to socialism, he was not enthusiastic about socialistic proposals, and is said to have remarked that he was patriotic enough to wish that some other nation should try them first.

But his chief interest, as is evident from his 'Life,' was in religious questions—an interest which, as we shall see in the later part of this article, was rendered specially intense by his system of philosophy. He was educated as a member of the Church of England, and regarded himself as a member of that Church when he was admitted to his fellowship in 1859. In 1862 we find him writing: 'At present, however, I am only a Theist; but I have vowed that it shall not be for want of profound and devoted study if I do not become a Christian.' The profound and devoted study lasted throughout his life, but he never returned to Christianity. The following extracts

from his letters will indicate his religious position. In 1880 he writes:—

'In fact, for many years I have not thought of Christianity except as the creed of my friends and fellow-countrymen, etc. But as regards Theism the case is different. . . . If I am asked whether I believe in a God, I should really have to say that I do not know—that is, I do not know whether I *believe* or merely *hope* that there is a moral order in this universe that we know, a supreme principle of Wisdom and Benevolence, guiding all things to good ends, and to the happiness of the good. I certainly *hope* that this is so, but I do not think it capable of being *proved*. All I can say is that no opposed explanation of the origin of the Cosmos—for instance, the atomistic explanation—seems to me even plausible, and that I cannot accept life on any other terms, or construct a rational system of my own conduct except on the basis of this faith.'

Again he writes, in 1886:—

'I find that I grow more and more, on the one hand, to regard Christianity as indispensable and irreplaceable—looking at it from a sociological point of view—and on the other hand to find it more and more incomprehensible how any one whom I feel to be really akin to myself in intellectual habits and culture, can possibly find his religion in it.' (In the same year he says), 'I tend to the view that the question of Personality, the point on which the theist as such differs from the atheist, is of no fundamental ethical importance. The question is *what* is the order of the cosmos, not whether it is a consciously planned order.'

We get an even clearer statement in 1891:—

'My attitude towards Christianity is briefly this. (1) I think Optimism in some form is an indispensable creed—not for every one, but for progressive humanity as a whole. (2) I think Optimism in a Theistic form—I mean the belief that there is a sympathetic soul of the Universe that intends the welfare of each particular human being and is guiding all the events of his life for his good—is, for the great majority of human beings, not only the most attractive form of Optimism, but the most easily acceptable, being not more unproven than any other form of Optimism, and certainly more completely satisfying to the deepest human needs. (3) I think that no form of Optimism has an adequate rational basis; therefore, if Theism is to be maintained—and I am inclined to predict that

the needs of the human heart will maintain it—it must be, for Europeans, by virtue of the support that it still obtains from the traditional belief in historical Christianity.’

His great interest in psychical research, too, was closely connected with the special importance which his ethical system caused him to attach to the question of a life after death. He had, however, begun to be interested in it even in his undergraduate days. He was one of the founders of the Society for Psychical Research, and its first president. He was always ready to give up his time to investigating any of the phenomena brought before the society, even when, as in the case of Eusapia Paladino, it involved weeks of experiments. Indeed, he considered the work so important as to allow considerations connected with it to have great weight in determining him to become a candidate, for the second time, for the professorship of moral philosophy. ‘I find,’ he writes, ‘that the Psychical Researchers think it better for the cause—at least this is Myers’s view. Also it is not yet clear that Psychical Research can occupy a great deal of one’s time; it depends on our finding “subjects.”’

Sidgwick’s activity, both as a lecturer and a writer, was many-sided. His ‘Principles of Political Economy,’ his ‘Elements of Politics,’ and his ‘Development of European Polity’ are all works of very considerable importance. In the ‘Principles of Political Economy’ especially, the clearness of his thought and his great power of analysis produced results of great value. He put forward no new theory of the subject as a whole; he adopted no new position towards the science; and his work, therefore, cannot be summarised or briefly described. But in every part of economics he cleared up difficulties and exposed ambiguities.

‘The Elements of Politics’ is a book of great interest. If it is not so much a scientific treatise as its author intended it to be, the cause must, I think, be sought in the nature of the subject, which does not seem at present to be in a state for really scientific treatment, whatever it may be in the future. There is as yet no body of doctrine in the science of politics which is universally admitted to be true by all competent students; and thus a work on politics cannot be much more than an expression of the more fundamental articles of the political

creed of its writer. This is really very much what Sidgwick has given us; and such an exposition, in the case of so wise and loyal a citizen was certainly worth having.

But his main interest was in philosophy; and, in philosophy, his chief work was done in ethics. Great as was the importance which, as we shall see, he attached to metaphysics, the metaphysical conclusions at which he was able to arrive were few in number, and mostly negative. His influence on the thought of his age was almost exclusively ethical.

His teaching on this subject is to be found in his 'Methods of Ethics,' the first edition of which was published in 1874, and the sixth, containing alterations made just before his death, in 1901. Each edition contained many alterations, but the variations were unimportant compared with what remained unchanged, and it is not necessary to refer to them here.

Sidgwick's treatment of ethics is mainly ethical in the strictest sense, and deals but little with psychology. He is primarily interested in the question of the nature of the good and the right, and not in the question of the historical development of our knowledge of them. And the question of how we are able to do right and to do wrong is also of subordinate importance for him. We may note in passing, however, his luminous treatment of the question of the freedom of the will, as to which he takes a characteristically balanced position. He points out the strong support which determinism gains from the fact that it is universally admitted to be valid as to all events but human actions. It is also, he observes, universally admitted to be valid as to those of our actions which are instinctive and involuntary, while it is impossible to draw a sharp line between voluntary and involuntary action. Again, we have no hesitation in inferring the future actions of men from their past actions; and, should our inferences prove erroneous, we do not attribute this to some act of free will, which is essentially unpredictable, but to some error in our knowledge of the determining facts. Against all this, however, Sidgwick sets 'the immediate affirmation of consciousness in the moment of deliberate action. Certainly when I have a distinct consciousness of choosing between alternatives of conduct,

one of which I conceive as right or reasonable, I find it impossible not to think that I can now choose to do what I so conceive, supposing that there is no obstacle to my doing it other than the condition of my desires and voluntary habits.'

This is regarded by him as so important that it balances the other arguments; and the result is that he finds himself unable to decide for either alternative. He points out, however, that no destructive effect on morality would logically result from the truth of determinism, and that, while it is true that a man may cover his immoral action by a sophistical use of determinist principles, he can just as easily cover it by a sophistical use of indeterminist principles. Nor does the truth or falsehood of determinism affect the question of the nature of the good or the right. Again, the determinist can affix a definite and reasonable meaning to such terms as 'merit' and 'responsibility'; and the punishment of crime is as reasonable for a determinist as for a libertarian. We have therefore, he holds, no practical evil to fear from the insolubility of the theoretical difficulty.

Let us return to Sidgwick's main problem, the determination of the nature of the right and the good. His position, summed up in technical language, is that he is an ethical hedonist, but not a psychological hedonist; that his ethical hedonism is universalistic and not egoistic; and that he is an intuitionist, but not of the ordinary type. Let us translate this condensed statement into a form which will be more generally intelligible.

In the first place, he was not a psychological hedonist. Psychological hedonism is the doctrine that the ultimate aim of every person in every action is to gain some pleasure for himself, or to avoid some pain for himself. (In some cases the further assertion is made that a man always acts in the way which he believes will procure him *more* pleasure than any other course which is open to him.) The chief advocates of this doctrine have been Bentham and J. S. Mill. Its truth or falsity will clearly have important consequences for ethics. But it is not itself an ethical proposition, since it does not tell us how we *ought* to act, but professes to point out to us how, in point of fact, we always *do* act. Hence it is called psychological.

Sidgwick rejects this view. Alike in the lowest and

the highest parts of our nature—in our animal desires and in patriotism and benevolence—we find desires which are not desires for pleasure. Take, for example, hunger. Men often, no doubt, eat, not because they are hungry, but because they desire the pleasure of eating. But when a man is hungry he has, to use Sidgwick's words, 'a direct impulse to the eating of food.' He does not desire the pleasure of eating, but he desires to eat for its own sake. Of course the satisfaction of this desire, as of any other desire, gives pleasure. But this secondary pleasure cannot be the object at which the desire is aimed, for it is only regarded as a pleasure when the desire has already arisen. In the same way a benevolent man does not desire to gain pleasure for himself by helping his neighbours. He desires to help his neighbours for their sake, not for his own. He will gain a secondary pleasure if his efforts are successful, but this success is only pleasant because it has been desired; and therefore what is desired is not the pleasure.

Every gratified desire produces a secondary pleasure—the pleasure of getting what you want—which is never the object of the desire. In those cases where the object of a desire is a pleasure—as when a *gourmand* eats for the pleasure of eating—he has also the secondary pleasure of getting what he wants. But it is not this secondary pleasure which makes his desire a desire for pleasure.

It has sometimes been said that the hungry man and the benevolent man, although not moved by the hope of future pleasure, are yet moved by the hope of getting rid of present pain—the pain of ungratified desire. But, as Sidgwick points out, all desire is not painful, and therefore it must move us otherwise than by urging us to free ourselves from it. Besides, if this theory were correct, all benevolent men would be just as well satisfied in whatever way their desire was removed—that is to say, they would as readily try to remove it by forgetting the distress of others as by relieving that distress. And this is notoriously not the case with a really benevolent man. Consequently there must be some men who desire to help others for the sake of the others, and not merely to spare themselves pain.

Sidgwick was not, of course, the first man who had pointed out that desires could be for other things than

pleasures. It was clearly recognised by Bishop Butler. And there can, I think, be no reasonable doubt (in spite of the contrary opinion of Green) that Sidgwick was right in his statement that Hume rejected psychological hedonism. The importance of Sidgwick's work on this subject lies in the fact that it came after a period in which psychological hedonism, as expounded by Bentham and Mill, had been dominant in English thought, and that it did more than any other influence to remove that dominance.

It is possible then for men to desire pleasures, and it is possible for them to desire other things. What ought they to desire? On this point Sidgwick is an intuitionist. That is to say, he holds that if we are to have any ethical knowledge at all, we must be able to start from some statement which we accept as self-evident *and which is itself an ethical statement*. No ethical statement—to put this last condition in another form—can be deduced from premises unless one at least of those premises is itself an ethical statement. It is impossible to deduce the nature of the good from any statements as to what does exist, or will exist, or cannot exist. Unless you start with the good, you will never be able to finish with it. In the same way with the conception of the right—that is, what we ought to do. No result can be obtained from statements which are confined to asserting what men must do, or generally do, or are developing the habit of doing, or must do if certain consequences are to be produced. Whatever follows from such premises as these, taken alone, will still leave the question whether we ought to do this or that unanswered. If we cannot find some ethical proposition which we can believe without proof, we can have no ethics at all.

Sidgwick is thus an intuitionist in ethics, since those ultimate propositions which are accepted without proof are usually called intuitions. His doctrine must, however, be carefully distinguished from the more ordinary forms of ethical intuitionism. Some people have maintained that our only moral intuitions are the declarations of our conscience on the rightness or wrongness of individual actions, and that we have no intuitions at all as to general rules of morality. In this case any science of ethics could only be inductive. Taking the declarations

of our own and our neighbours' consciences as our data, we could endeavour to discover by induction what general qualities were shared by actions which were approved by those consciences, and what general qualities were shared by actions that were condemned.

This view, however, is not very common. It is more usual to hold that we have intuitions as to the rightness or wrongness of certain classes of actions. Thus it is held that we know intuitively that it is wrong to commit murder, right to tell the truth, and the like. This is the most common form of intuitionism, and would probably be found to be the most popular of all ethical theories.

Sidgwick, however, does not accept this view, for reasons to which I shall return. He holds that our trustworthy ultimate judgments on ethics are fewer and simpler than is maintained by ordinary intuitionism. The intuitions which he accepts are five in number. The first two have more direct reference to the good, and the last three to the right and to our duty, though the first two also aid in the determination of right action.

The first of these principles is as follows: 'We can find nothing that, on reflection, appears to possess' the 'quality of goodness out of relation to human existence, or at least to some consciousness or feeling.' (From Sidgwick's express declaration in other passages as to the lower animals it is clear that he intends the words 'some consciousness or feeling' to include all sentient beings.) Nothing then is good as an end except some state of a conscious being; and nothing is good as a means except as tending to bring about some state of a conscious being.

Since this is put forward as an intuition, it is clear that it is useless to ask for a proof. For those who feel it to be an ultimate and self-evident proposition no proof is required. On the other hand, they will be unable to convince any other person who does not recognise the proposition as self-evident. In the case of this particular proposition, however, the assent of ethical thinkers, and indeed of mankind in general, would be almost universal. A different view has lately been defended with much force by Mr G. E. Moore in his 'Principia Ethica,' but it has very few supporters.

But what—this will be the next question—is the characteristic of a state of consciousness which makes it good?

For although nothing but such states are good as ends, it is evident that all such states are not good. Some of them would be universally recognised as being very bad. On this subject Sidgwick accepts another judgment as intuitively true. This is the judgment that a state of consciousness is good as an end in so far as it is a state of happiness or pleasure (these two words are used as synonymous), and is bad in so far as it is a state of unhappiness or pain. We must not forget that a state of consciousness which is itself a state of happiness, and so good as an end, may produce or involve a state of unhappiness in the future, or for some other person, and so be bad as a means. And if it produces or involves unhappiness greater than its own happiness, then, on the whole, it is to be condemned. Thus the state of consciousness of a man who was enjoying a combat of gladiators might deserve condemnation if the pain which it involved for others was greater than the pleasure it contained for him.

We now pass to the intuitions which more directly concern the right. Sidgwick does not explicitly lay down—what might indeed be regarded as a tautology—that we ought to prefer the good to the bad. He proceeds at once to two principles, which he calls respectively the principles of prudence and of rational benevolence.

The principle of prudence is as follows: 'I ought not to prefer a present lesser good to a future greater good.' He compares the self-evidence of this proposition to that of the axiom, 'If equals be added to equals, the wholes are equal.' A future good, indeed, is almost always less certain than a present good, and in making our choice we shall do well to make allowance for the greater uncertainty of the bird in the bush. But when this allowance has been made—as Sidgwick supposes it to have been—it may be accepted as self-evident that it is wrong to prefer the smaller good because it is nearer.

The principle of rational benevolence is, 'I ought not to prefer my own lesser good to the greater good of another.' To this Sidgwick ascribes the same self-evidence as to the last. Here, again, it is assumed that the good of the other man remains greater, after due allowance has been made for the greater uncertainty which often—though not always—attends our efforts for the good of others as compared with our efforts for our own good.

This principle does not afford by itself a sufficient basis for rational benevolence. For that, it would be necessary to add to it the principle, 'I ought not to prefer the lesser good of one fellow-being to the greater good of another fellow-being.' Or the two principles could be combined in one by saying that I ought not to prefer the lesser good of any sentient being to the greater good of any other sentient being. Sidgwick realised the necessity of treating good as equally valuable to whichever of our fellow-beings it occurred, but he did not think it necessary to lay it down as one of his intuitions. His reason may have been that this principle is seldom denied in any ethical theory, while many such theories have maintained that a man should prefer his own good to that of any one else. It was therefore more important to emphasise other people's equality with myself than to emphasise other people's equality with one another.

Thus Sidgwick's position is one of ethical hedonism. He does not maintain that we *can* only aim at pleasure, but he maintains that we *ought* not to aim at anything, unless by doing so we shall produce more pleasure than we should produce by any other course open to us. It must be noticed that this does not involve that we ought to aim at nothing but pleasure. For experience shows that the best way to get the most pleasure is not always to aim at it. If we desire other things—the solution of a problem, success in work or success in play—for their own sake, we shall gain more pleasure from pursuing these ends and succeeding in them than we should have gained if we had always aimed at the pleasure. And therefore ethical hedonism teaches us that it is well to aim at other things besides pleasure. But it also teaches us that it is well from time to time, 'in a calm hour,' to consider whether our activities, which are not aimed at pleasure, do bring in more pleasure than any alternative activities would, and to continue them only if we are of opinion that they do so. Thus a student ought to ask himself occasionally whether he gains more pleasure for himself and others by devoting himself to the pursuit of learning than he would by any other possible course of action; and he ought only to persevere in the pursuit of learning if he can answer this question in the affirmative.

For although nothing but such states are good as ends, it is evident that all such states are not good. Some of them would be universally recognised as being very bad. On this subject Sidgwick accepts another judgment as intuitively true. This is the judgment that a state of consciousness is good as an end in so far as it is a state of happiness or pleasure (these two words are used as synonymous), and is bad in so far as it is a state of unhappiness or pain. We must not forget that a state of consciousness which is itself a state of happiness, and so good as an end, may produce or involve a state of unhappiness in the future, or for some other person, and so be bad as a means. And if it produces or involves unhappiness greater than its own happiness, then, on the whole, it is to be condemned. Thus the state of consciousness of a man who was enjoying a combat of gladiators might deserve condemnation if the pain which it involved for others was greater than the pleasure it contained for him.

We now pass to the intuitions which more directly concern the right. Sidgwick does not explicitly lay down—what might indeed be regarded as a tautology—that we ought to prefer the good to the bad. He proceeds at once to two principles, which he calls respectively the principles of prudence and of rational benevolence.

The principle of prudence is as follows: 'I ought not to prefer a present lesser good to a future greater good.' He compares the self-evidence of this proposition to that of the axiom, 'If equals be added to equals, the wholes are equal.' A future good, indeed, is almost always less certain than a present good, and in making our choice we shall do well to make allowance for the greater uncertainty of the bird in the bush. But when this allowance has been made—as Sidgwick supposes it to have been—it may be accepted as self-evident that it is wrong to prefer the smaller good because it is nearer.

The principle of rational benevolence is, 'I ought not to prefer my own lesser good to the greater good of another.' To this Sidgwick ascribes the same self-evidence as to the last. Here, again, it is assumed that the good of the other man remains greater, after due allowance has been made for the greater uncertainty which often—though not always—attends our efforts for the good of others as compared with our efforts for our own good.

This principle does not afford by itself a sufficient basis for rational benevolence. For that, it would be necessary to add to it the principle, 'I ought not to prefer the lesser good of one fellow-being to the greater good of another fellow-being.' Or the two principles could be combined in one by saying that I ought not to prefer the lesser good of any sentient being to the greater good of any other sentient being. Sidgwick realised the necessity of treating good as equally valuable to whichever of our fellow-beings it occurred, but he did not think it necessary to lay it down as one of his intuitions. His reason may have been that this principle is seldom denied in any ethical theory, while many such theories have maintained that a man should prefer his own good to that of any one else. It was therefore more important to emphasise other people's equality with myself than to emphasise other people's equality with one another.

Thus Sidgwick's position is one of ethical hedonism. He does not maintain that we *can* only aim at pleasure, but he maintains that we *ought* not to aim at anything, unless by doing so we shall produce more pleasure than we should produce by any other course open to us. It must be noticed that this does not involve that we ought to aim at nothing but pleasure. For experience shows that the best way to get the most pleasure is not always to aim at it. If we desire other things—the solution of a problem, success in work or success in play—for their own sake, we shall gain more pleasure from pursuing these ends and succeeding in them than we should have gained if we had always aimed at the pleasure. And therefore ethical hedonism teaches us that it is well to aim at other things besides pleasure. But it also teaches us that it is well from time to time, 'in a calm hour,' to consider whether our activities, which are not aimed at pleasure, do bring in more pleasure than any alternative activities would, and to continue them only if we are of opinion that they do so. Thus a student ought to ask himself occasionally whether he gains more pleasure for himself and others by devoting himself to the pursuit of learning than he would by any other possible course of action; and he ought only to persevere in the pursuit of learning if he can answer this question in the affirmative.

Sidgwick's ethical hedonism is, further, universalistic. The pleasure which it is my duty to increase as far as possible is not only or specially my own. (This will require qualification when we come to his fifth ethical intuition, which we have not yet reached.) This is not necessarily involved in ethical hedonism, nor in the rejection of psychological hedonism. It would be possible to hold that man did not always aim at pleasure, and to hold that each man's duty was to aim at whatever in the long run produced the most pleasure for him, regardless of others. In this case hedonism would not be universalistic, but egoistic. But the principle of rational benevolence involves the rejection of egoism. It tells each of us that his happiness should be of no more value to him than the happiness of any other sentient being, and that he ought to be prepared to choose intense misery for himself, if by that means he could avert even greater misery from other people.

It may be remarked in passing that this distinction of 'egoistic' and 'universalistic' does not exist in the case of psychological hedonism. Whenever it is asserted that a man can only aim at pleasure, it is always meant that he can only aim at his own pleasure. Everything which made psychological hedonism appear plausible at all pointed to this conclusion. If it were once seen that a man could aim at anything which was not his own pleasure, there could be no further ground for denying that he could aim at something which was not pleasure at all.

Thus a psychological hedonist must always deny the possibility of unselfish action, since all action was directed to the pleasure of the agent. Actions which are commonly regarded as unselfish he must regard as done because the agent's nature is such that he gets more pleasure out of it (or, according to Mill's form of the theory, a pleasure of more exquisite quality) than he could have got out of any other course open to him.

It is important to emphasise the distinction between egoistic and universalistic hedonism, and again between ethical and psychological hedonism, because they are often confounded. There is a strong tendency, especially among the disciples of the late Professor Green, to assume that every one who holds that pleasure is the only good is bound to believe that a man should only act for *his*

own greatest pleasure; and that any one who accepts the first of these positions and rejects the second is only illogically refusing to acknowledge the distasteful consequences of his original attitude. This mistake as to ethical hedonism seems to be based on two other errors. In the first place, ethical hedonism is confounded with psychological hedonism. In the second place, it is supposed that psychological hedonism says that a man *should* act for his own greatest good, when all that it does is to assert that a man *must* act for his own greatest good.

One of the most important features of Sidgwick's system is the defence which he makes of his hedonistic intuitionism as against the more common form of intuitionism, which holds that we have intuitions which command us to practise special virtues and avoid special sins. A definite proof of the one system, or a definite disproof of the other, would be impossible. As has been already said, an intuition claims to be self-evident. Its evidence, therefore, rests on nothing else; and, if any one rejects it, it is impossible to prove that he is wrong and that those who accept it are right. If any one does not find the proposition that pleasure, as such, is good to be self-evident, while other people do find it self-evident, each person must abide by his own opinion.

It is possible, however, in certain cases, to show that what appeared to be a difference of this sort—ultimate and incurable—is not really so. A man may believe that he accepts some proposition as intuitively certain, of which he has not fully understood the meaning and the implications. When he has seen what is involved in his acceptance of it, he may see that he does not really believe all this. Again, a man may believe that some proposition which he accepts is accepted by him as intuitively certain, and he may subsequently be convinced that he did not hold it as intuitive and self-evident, but as a consequence of some more fundamental proposition.

It is in such ways as these that Sidgwick deals with the more ordinary form of intuitionism. He takes successively the various virtues—benevolence, justice, fidelity, veracity, temperance, purity, courage, humility—and considers what the common opinion of good men holds about each of them. He shows that it is impossible to assert that any simple principle can be the intuitive basis of

our duty in respect to any of these virtues. For any simple principle would either include among what is allowed much that is universally admitted to be wrong, or include among what is forbidden much that is universally admitted to be right. If we try to lay down a principle which, for example, includes in its condemnation all the lies that would be recognised as wrong, while it excluded from its condemnation all lies that would be recognised as right, it cannot possibly be simple. If such a principle can be found at all, it would be so complicated that its self-evidence would be, at the least, very dubious. And in the case of many duties it would be impossible to lay down a rule at all.

Thus the hypothesis that we have intuitions which commend or forbid certain classes of acts without reference to their hedonistic results is discredited. For when we look into the matter, it is, Sidgwick says, impossible to state with any accuracy any propositions which would be accepted as intuitively evident. But, he goes on to show, our moral judgments and our moral practice can be accounted for simply and easily on the hypothesis that what men really regard as intuitively certain is ethical hedonism. When we look through the various cases in which morality permits or forbids the taking of life or the breaking of promises, when we consider the circumstances under which it praises or blames the disregard of danger or the practice of economy, we are led to the conclusion that that conduct is permitted and praised which is held to increase pleasure, while that is forbidden and blamed which is held to increase pain. (In certain cases, of course, our present morality is found to permit and forbid, not what would now be held to promote pleasure and pain respectively, but what has been held to promote them in the past. Morality is always largely affected by tradition.) His conclusion is that the great majority of mankind govern their actions by the principles of ethical hedonism, and would be prepared, if the issue were clearly set before them, to accept those principles as intuitively evident.

The chapters of 'The Methods of Ethics' in which this contention is worked out are perhaps the most characteristic of all Sidgwick's writings. His knowledge of life, his wide sympathies, his scrupulous fairness to opponents,

all combined to make him specially fitted for the analysis of the contents of the generally accepted moral code.

We now come to the most curious feature of Sidgwick's ethical system. This rests on the fifth* of his intuitions, which is that 'a man's own happiness is an end which it is irrational for him to sacrifice to any other.'

Thus Sidgwick's final position is not simply universalistic hedonism. The maxim of that position is always to act so as to increase as much as possible the amount of pleasure of all sentient beings. And this Sidgwick accepts. But side by side with it he puts this other maxim: Never act so as to sacrifice your own happiness. And, since happiness is sacrificed whenever we miss a chance of increasing it, this maxim can be put in the form: Always act so as to increase as much as possible the amount of your own pleasure.

Here, therefore, we have two maxims, each claiming to control the whole of our action, each controlling it on a different principle. It is, at any rate, conceivable that they should, in some cases, lead us in different directions. In that case complete moral chaos would result, since, however we acted, we should violate an ultimate moral law, and therefore do wrong. Sidgwick therefore concludes that, if morality is to remain completely rational, a harmony between these two maxims must be somehow demonstrated—that is, it must be shown that conduct prescribed by the one maxim could never be condemned by the other, and that a man will never diminish his own happiness by promoting the happiness of the world at large.

Is he right in introducing this dualism into ethics? Since it is a question of intuitions it must be left for each person to decide for himself. Sidgwick did feel both of these maxims to have an intuitively certain validity.

But when he goes on to say that this view appears to him, on the whole, to be the view of common-sense, he passes into a field in which discussion is possible. And

* Sidgwick speaks of this as the maxim of prudence. But it is not identical with what he has previously called the maxim of prudence—'I ought not to prefer a present lesser good to a future greater good.' This is not confined to the good of the agent, but applies to *any* good. Sidgwick reached it through a consideration of egoism, but it is not confined to egoism.

here, I confess, it seems to me that he is wrong. By common-sense, he tells us, he means the opinion of 'the *consensus* of mankind—or at least of that portion of mankind which combines adequate intellectual enlightenment with a serious concern for morality.'

Now it does not seem to me that intelligent and virtuous men would, as a rule, regard it as sinful to sacrifice one's own happiness in order to promote greater happiness in others. According to Sidgwick they would regard it as sinful either to do this or not to do this. But I think that they would regard the sacrifice as virtuous, and not as sinful at all. They would, no doubt, say that it was wrong that the man should be compelled to sacrifice either his own happiness or the happiness of others—that is, that there was something unsatisfactory in a world where a man had to choose between happiness and benevolence. But if he chose benevolence, it seems to me that they would say that, whatever was unsatisfactory in the world, it was not his morality in that choice.

It must be noticed that the rejection of Sidgwick's fifth intuition would not lead us to asceticism, nor to the denial that it was the duty of each man to promote his own happiness when there was no reason to the contrary. For we should still be left with the principle that it was each man's duty to promote, as far as possible, the happiness of all sentient beings; and he is himself one of these. All that we should have to say was that a virtuous man, while promoting his own happiness so far as it did not prevent the greater happiness of others, must be prepared to sacrifice it when, by that sacrifice, the total amount of happiness would be increased.

Can we hope to demonstrate the harmony between the two maxims which will, on Sidgwick's theory, be necessary for the coherence of morality? Can we, in the first place, show empirically that the benevolence of a benevolent man will always make him happier than he would have been if he had not been benevolent? Sidgwick does not think this possible. It is true that benevolence is a source of great and exquisite pleasures, and that to care only for one's own happiness is generally a sure way of making oneself unhappy. But there are cases where benevolence and selfishness point different ways. The success of the

greatest reforms has often involved a life of suffering to the reformer, especially when he did not live to see the success of his work. And even a man who has no ambition to be a reformer may be placed in a situation where his duty to his country or to the world at large may compel him to sacrifice, not merely the lower pleasures of life, but the higher—to abandon art, learning, love, for some almost hopeless effort, to avert some great calamity from people for whom he feels only indifference or perhaps repugnance.

The only alternative that remains, Sidgwick holds, is to be able to show, not from empirical observation, but by deduction from the general nature of the universe, that I shall be adequately rewarded if I do my best to promote universal happiness and adequately punished if I do not do so. (By 'adequate' is here meant, he tells us, 'sufficient to make it the agent's interest to promote universal good.')

The simplest way of proving this would be to prove that there was a God who desired such a result, and whose power, whether infinite or not, was sufficient to carry out His will. But this is not the only way in which it could be established. Buddhism has developed the idea of such rewards and punishments to a greater extent than Christianity. But enlightened Buddhists reject all belief in a God and conceive these rewards and punishments as distributed by the operation of an impersonal law.

What is required, however, is that the universe should be shown to be ruled by some power which is not indifferent to moral considerations. And it must also be a power which distributes happiness more or less in proportion to morality. It is not sufficient that the benevolent man should be in the long run happy. He must be at least as happy as he would have been if he had not been benevolent. And since benevolence certainly makes a man on some occasions lose happiness which he would otherwise have gained, it will be necessary to hold that this is compensated by his receiving other happiness which he would otherwise have missed.

It may also be said, I think, though Sidgwick does not mention it in 'The Methods of Ethics,' that it is essential to believe in some life, whether endless or not, after death.

For, as has been said above, it is a matter of empirical observation that, so far as the present life is concerned, a man often diminishes his own happiness by his endeavours to increase the total amount of happiness.

Whether all this can be shown or not is a question which ethics cannot discuss. And here Sidgwick ends 'The Methods of Ethics' with this problem, on which the coherence of ethics depends, still fronting us unsolved. If we abandoned the attempt to solve it, he says, morality would not go altogether, for there would be many cases in which one of the two competing laws urged us to a certain course, while the other either urged us in the same direction or gave us no commands at all. In these cases our duty would still be clear. But when general happiness and the happiness of the agent were in opposition to each other, 'practical reason, being divided against itself, would cease to be a motive on either side; the conflict would have to be decided by the comparative preponderance of one or other of two groups of non-rational impulses.'

Thus for Sidgwick the problems of religion assumed a special importance. On a favourable solution of those problems depended for him not only the possibility of regarding the universe as a whole as good, but the possibility of acting rightly. For most thinkers there remains, at any rate, the comfort of holding that, however indifferent or opposed to good the universe may be, it is possible for each man who chooses to do so to fight on the side of the good. But for Sidgwick the dictates of our moral nature were such that a man cannot in circumstances which often occur act rightly unless the universe is a just universe.

The simplest way of arriving at the desired conclusions would be to accept the belief in a just and powerful God on the authority of one of the religions which claim to be revealed. But this, as I have said, Sidgwick found himself unable to do after a comparatively early age. There remained the possibility of proving these conclusions by metaphysical reasoning.

This has been attempted in two different ways. In the first place, it is sometimes maintained that the nature of all reality is essentially spiritual, a view commonly called idealism. From this the conclusion is drawn (of

course by a fresh and often elaborate chain of reasoning) that reality as a whole cannot be indifferent to the needs of our spiritual nature. From this again, if Sidgwick's conclusions as to what is required to make morality coherent are correct, it might be argued that the nature of reality must be such as to ensure that a man in acting for the general welfare would not sacrifice his own.

This course, however, was not open to Sidgwick, for he was not an idealist. Unfortunately, he wrote no systematic treatise on metaphysics; such a treatise would have been of the utmost value. But we have among his posthumous works a rather full criticism of the philosophy of Kant, and again of the philosophy of Green. He had studied both closely and found himself unable to agree with either.

Much of the idealism of Sidgwick's time depended on Kant and much on Green. But another influence was still more powerful—the influence of Hegel. Sidgwick was far too well read in the history of philosophy to fall into the common mistake of supposing Green to be an Hegelian, or to believe that Hegel had been disposed of when Green was refuted. But we have no account of the reasons why Sidgwick condemned Hegelianism. We see from his 'Life' that in 1870 he was studying Hegel with the thoroughness with which he did everything. He seems to have made up his mind then that the road to truth did not lie through Hegel's philosophy, and to have put it definitely on one side.

But in abandoning idealism we do not necessarily abandon the hope of attaining by metaphysical arguments to a satisfactory solution of the problems of religion. Dualists hold that spirit and matter are equally real. But if, as is generally the case, they hold that above finite spirit and matter there is a supreme being of a spiritual nature by whom finite spirit and matter are controlled, there is still a chance of the desired result. For if such a being can be shown to be good and to be sufficiently powerful, the same results might be expected from his nature as from the nature of a universe which was entirely spiritual.

Sidgwick, so far as he had arrived at definite metaphysical conclusions at all, would seem to have been a dualist. It is, perhaps, not too much to say that he was

more in sympathy with Reid than with any other metaphysician. So far as I know he never criticised in any of his published writings the ordinary arguments by which so many dualists arrive at theism. But, as we have seen, he never found himself able to believe in the later part of his life that the existence of God could be proved.

If no help could be obtained from revelation or from metaphysics, could anything be hoped for from empirical enquiries? It would certainly be impossible to prove empirically either the existence of God or the reasonableness of the universe. But it is at any rate conceivable that empirical evidence should convince us that human beings survive the death of their present bodies.

Such evidence could never prove immortality. A man who survived the death of his body might yet be destined to perish at the end of some finite period. But, if it were proved that we survived the death of our bodies, the chief reason for doubting our immortality would have gone. Moreover, it was not necessary for the purpose of Sidgwick's ethical theories that immortality should be established. It was necessary to establish some life after death in order that the self-sacrifice involved in benevolence should find compensation somewhere, since it notoriously does not always find compensation here. But for this purpose another life of finite length might possibly be sufficient.

This explains the special interest which psychical research had for Sidgwick. It was not merely the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake. It was not merely the hope of adding to human happiness by establishing the belief in immortality. It was the hope of establishing what he regarded as the essential condition of a rational morality. Indeed, when he began to doubt whether he should ever succeed in this direction, he doubted whether he could continue to teach ethics at all. In 1887 he wrote:

'I have been facing the fact that I am drifting steadily to the conclusion—I have by no means arrived at it, but am certainly drifting towards it—that we have not, and are never likely to have, empirical evidence of the existence of the individual after death. . . . Some fifteen years ago, when I was writing my book on Ethics, I was inclined to hold with Kant that we must *postulate* the continued existence of the soul in order to

effect that harmony of Duty with Happiness which seemed to me indispensable to rational moral life. At any rate I thought I might *provisionally* postulate it, while setting out on the serious search for empirical evidence. If I decide that this search is a failure, shall I finally and decisively make this postulate? Can I consistently with my whole view of truth and the method of its attainment? And if I answer "no" to each of these questions, have I any ethical system at all? And if not, can I continue to be Professor and absorb myself in the mere erudition of the subject? . . . I am nearly forty-nine, and I do not find a taste for the old clothes of opinions growing on me.'

Fortunately for philosophy and for Cambridge, he did not finally adopt this view as to his professorship.

The concluding words of 'The Methods of Ethics,' in all the editions, indicate that he had some hope that it might be legitimate to infer that a harmony between benevolence and self-interest must exist, because otherwise there would arise 'a fundamental contradiction in one chief department of our thought.' But it would seem that this was for him only a hope, and not a definite belief, since in 1880 and 1891, after having written 'The Methods of Ethics,' he wrote, as we have seen, that he did not consider that the moral order of the universe was capable of demonstration.

Such a position must always be painful, since a universe which is constituted with no regard for the good is not one in which we can hope to find satisfaction. But for Sidgwick it was more tragic than for many other philosophers. His views on ethics compelled him to regard not only our chance of happiness, but our chance of virtue, as dependent on the moral order of the universe, since without such an order the fundamental dictates of our moral nature became mutually contradictory.

Yet with so much hanging on the issue he was able to consider it with the same calmness and impartiality as if he had been dealing with some issue of no practical importance. His courage and his devotion to truth could have had no stronger proof. But, great as they were, they were only in their fitting place in a character so noble and so inspiring that to have known Sidgwick is a great responsibility.

J. ELLIS McTAGGART.

Art. VI.—MUNICIPAL SOCIALISM.

1. *Municipal Trade*. By Major Leonard Darwin. London: Murray, 1903.
 2. *Municipal Socialism*. A series of articles reprinted from the 'Times,' 1902.
 3. *The Common Sense of Municipal Trading*. By Bernard Shaw. London: Constable, 1904.
 4. *London Municipal Notes*. A Monthly Review of Municipal Work and Progress (1905-6). London Municipal Society, 11 Tothill Street, S.W.
- And other works.

THERE are times and there are subjects in which controversy seems to have reached a stage of exhaustion. The combatants have marshalled their arguments, but agreement is more distant than ever. Decision, if there is to be decision, must be dictated by superior force; and the force which to-day is in the hands of a political majority is more crushing than any that formerly was at the disposal of arbitrary power. It is, at such times, that the policy of the minority seems like to become one of the lost causes of history. The world goes forward with the cry 'whatever is is right.' The inevitable present with which each generation has to deal seems to be dominated by an irresistible momentum which carries all before it, till the friction which accompanies all movement sets up a reaction, and we are puzzled to know whether it will prove temporary or permanent.

The detached philosopher, viewing man and society as part of the cosmos, may see, or think he sees, some intelligible principle in the evolution of human destiny; and this principle, if such there be, must have governed the general trend of man's development in society. At the same time there are obviously long periods of action and reaction and of transfusion of energy, during which it is difficult for the passengers, if the phrase may be allowed, to forecast the duration of a prevailing sentiment, or to feel sure what the ultimate result of a current controversy will be. The only thing about which we can be certain is that there will be change.

We are living now under the influence of a great reaction from an earlier political philosophy which is

variously named the Manchester school or, as we think, more adequately the Liberal school of economics, as understood in the earlier writings of Mill, when, in his essay on Liberty, he emphatically proclaimed that the basis of social well-being and progress was the competence of the individual character acquired, disciplined, and perfected in an atmosphere of personal responsibility or liberty. Mill was, in some respects, a microcosm of his age; and the later phases of his philosophy were, consciously or unconsciously, affected by the socialist aspirations which were then only beginning to exercise an influence on modern politics, and which now, unless we are entirely mistaken, lie at the back of the present enthusiasm for municipal trading.

Since the days of Mill, speculation as to the possibilities of human society has been profoundly modified by the general acceptance of the doctrine of evolution. The precise relation of this doctrine to practical politics is still matter of dispute; but every controversialist admits that he must reckon with it, and seeks to make his view square with what he supposes to be the revelation of the evolutionary theory. On the one hand, the earlier view of Mill has been developed and emphasised; and it has been urged that the paramount interest of social evolution still lies in the continuous development of the individual or social unit. His social and economic competence is the base on which the social superstructure most safely rests. His habits and character are plastic; they can be strengthened, directed, or even reduced by disuse to atrophy, as free social experience dictates. The rest of his environment, though by no means constant, is, relatively to him and to his power of control, more rigid and more inevitable. Attempts made by the community in its corporate capacity to alter external circumstances in a way that, incidentally, is detrimental to the competent, for the sake of the less competent, are in this view a reversal of the principle of progress, and apt to become a deliberate domestication of a parasitic and degenerate growth. Such is the conception of those who put their trust in the economic development of society.

To others the same wave of sentiment which carried Mill away from his earlier moorings has suggested the argument that society, having itself become an entity, has

a law of growth not subordinate to that of the units of which it is composed. The economic order is plainly imperfect; and society declines at times to wait on the slowly grinding processes of economic development. Society's power of domesticating uneconomic varieties of life within its own vital system has been asserted and used, as in the poor-law, education and factory Acts, and with results that are hailed as more or less satisfactory. The question is then pressed: cannot we go much further in this direction?

Hitherto the complaint has been made, and with undeniable justice, that there is a divorce between popular government and scientific reasoning with regard to politics. The difficulty, nay, the impossibility, of getting the average man to shape his action with a view to results that can only come indirectly and after much delay is obvious; and it becomes greater with the widening of the bases of democratic power. Neither of the theoretical views above set out has been adopted absolutely by those who are responsible for practical legislation. At a given moment superficial circumstances seem to support the truth of one or other of these rival theories. Empirical legislation has been devised to meet temporary evils; and opportunism has been more powerful than speculative theory. This, in a subject matter where change cannot be made *per saltum*, or without initial friction, is inevitable. There are, however, signs of the rise of a new spirit. Ideas, based, some of them, on most fantastic reasoning, are playing a larger part in our politics; and theoretical considerations are now determining policy on minor points of detail in a way contrary to what might have been expected from a purely practical and opportunist consideration of the facts. To what other cause can we attribute the determination of the majority of the London County Council to persist in running a service of steamboats on the Thames at a loss of some 53,000*l.* per annum? Clearly the minds of those responsible are possessed by some consideration, higher than ordinarily obtains in such matters.

'Municipal trading' (says Mr Bernard Shaw) 'seems a very simple matter of business. Yet it is conceivable by a sensible man that the political struggle over it may come nearer to a civil war than any issue raised in England since the Reform Bill of 1832.'

Till the other day, he goes on to say, municipal trading attracted little notice, but 'the heading has lately changed in the "Times" to "Municipal Socialism"; and this, in fact, is what is really on foot among us under the name of Progressivism.' It is in avowals like this that we discover the true inwardness of the motives which are hurrying us along unexplored paths. The appeal to balance-sheets and trading-accounts is quite irrelevant and does not touch the motives which decide for and against the new proposals. At present, it is true, municipal socialism works under forms of commercial trading and publishes more or less untrustworthy balance-sheet showing the result of what still purports to be buying and selling. This archaic pretence is kept up for the sake of the weaker brethren who are habituated to debtor and creditor accounts and all the other categories of commercial accountancy. Fundamentally, however, the moving and regulating force is not expectation of profit. It arises out of quite other considerations. It seems to its supporters to fulfil certain conditions which they have much at heart. Private trading postulates the convenience and equity of allowing profit to the successful organisers of industry. The municipal socialist, on the contrary, regards profit as a fraud on the community, and, except when he is arguing *ad hominem*, to the stupid *bourgeois* whose fears he wishes to allay, he glories in the fact that profit is not made. Advantage, benefit, and other characteristics of the millennium are distributed broadcast; but profit is a feature which has to disappear from his Utopia. Clearly the aspirations of those whose minds are possessed by the new Evangel have led them to disregard the ordinary tests of commercial success. They invite us, in short, to learn a new industrial language and a new industrial logic.

Let us follow the working of the socialist mind under the competent guidance of Mr Shaw. 'We must conclude,' he says (p. 19), 'not merely that the commercial test is a misleading one, but that the desirability of municipal trading is actually in inverse ratio to its commercial profitableness.' To meet this novel conception of things Mr Shaw suggests a novel method of account-keeping. Shortly, the plan is this. We debit private enterprise with the cost of the poor-law, workhouse, and

infirmary, police, prisons, and all the other ills to which flesh is heir; and the available dividend is of course largely reduced. Then, for purposes of comparison, we assume that these evils largely cease with the introduction of municipal socialism, and credit the municipal trading-account accordingly. Wonderful results can be attained by this kind of political arithmetic. Mr Shaw gives some concrete examples, e.g.,

'the case of a great dock company. Near the docks three institutions are sure to be found—a workhouse, an infirmary, and a police-court. . . . Into that workhouse every dock labourer can walk at any moment, and, by announcing himself as a destitute person, compel the guardians to house and feed and clothe him at the expense of the ratepayers. When he begins to tire of the monotony of "the able-bodied ward" and its futile labour, he can wait till a ship comes in; demand his discharge; do a day's work at the docks; spend the proceeds in a carouse and a debauch; and return to the workhouse next morning, again a destitute person. This is systematically done at present by numbers of men who are by no means the least intelligent or capable of their class.'

Then the other picture:—

'A municipality cannot pick the ratepayers' pocket in this fashion. . . . Consequently the municipality, on taking over the docks, would be forced to aim in the first instance at organising its work so as to provide steady permanent employment for its labourers at a living wage, even at the cost of being overstaffed on slack days, until the difficulty has been solved by new organisation and machinery, as such difficulties always are when they can no longer be shirked. Under these conditions it is quite possible that the profits made formerly by the dock company might disappear, but if a considerable part of the pauperism and crime of the neighbourhood disappeared simultaneously, the bargain would be a very profitable one indeed for the ratepayers . . .' (p. 23).

Surely never was reformation of the carouser and the debauchee so miraculously effected!

A difficulty, however, is apprehended by Mr Shaw, namely, that the official auditors whose appointment is recommended by the recent Commission on Municipal Trading are not likely to pass 'these invisible credits'; and 'Parliament is still disposed to apply the commercial

test to communal enterprise.' 'There is, in fact, for the moment, a serious menace to municipal enterprise in the cry for commercial auditing. Fortunately the demand is not a permanently practical one.' Municipal auditing, as distinct from commercial auditing, 'will finally develop as a practically separate profession' (p. 85). If such invisible credits as the reformed carouser and debauchee are to figure largely in the assets passed by our new accountancy, no doubt a new profession is required.

The British Philistine is, we have admitted, a little bitten with the socialist frenzy; but this new political arithmetic will occasionally appear to him somewhat topsy-turvy. He will ask, still stupidly obsessed, as Mr Shaw would say, by irrelevant commercial ideals, what is now to replace the motive of the private undertaker, and how is the capital for industry to be provided? To this Mr Shaw has his airy reply. Ability is a commodity which can be hired in the market; but, in a system which contemplates the abolition of the market, surely this is a hard saying. Economic production at a cost which will be well covered by the available purchasing power of the community is no longer an object. We are trading largely for the sake of invisible profits; and in matters of invisible profit the mere able man of industry is as a child. The municipality, for instance, is owner of gas-works. Its object is not to sell gas to those who are willing to purchase it at a price which will give a profit either to shareholders or ratepayers. Its object is to give permanent employment to a happy and contented staff of gas-workers, to light the dark places of the town, to see that the poor man's house is lighted as brilliantly as that of the rich, and to take care somehow that no one, even remotely connected with the gas-works, is either a carouser or a debauchee. This is a task not for ability but for collectivist faith-healing. Its organiser, we suggest, should rather be the civic enthusiast who has some skill in the management of public meetings, and who, when his fellow-citizens want to have electric light, can urge them with glowing eloquence to rest content with the inferior light for the sake of the common property of the town, now sunk in a gas-plant, and for the sake of the staff, who otherwise would find their occupation gone if they would not consent to be cruelly over-

worked in learning a new trade. This is a task for an inspired political wire-puller, not for the mere able man of industry.

It is not want of sympathy with socialist ideals, but absolute scepticism as to the practicability of the proposed methods of achieving them, that deters the liberal economist. He has a tempered faith in the ameliorative processes of liberty. On the whole, the free organisation of industry does give advantage to diligence and trustworthiness, does discourage and ultimately procure the correction or supersession of inefficient methods and character, while it allows us to avail ourselves of the improvements which the progress of science puts within our reach. This view promises no immediate millennium, but it explains our progress in the past, and seems to guarantee a similar advance in the future. This very phenomenon of socialism—what is it, he asks, but a sign of a righteous but over-sensitive social morality which has grown up under the very system which it seeks to demolish? With this charter of progress, such as it is, the liberal economist must be content. To him Mr Shaw's idea that industry can be carried on without being subjected to the test of finance, and without the motive power arising from the expectation of profit, seems wildly fantastic, if not altogether unimaginable. The only socialist system which has been worked out in detail is that of Marx; and this, we understand, is now generally disavowed by the socialists themselves. Be that as it may, Mr Shaw's sense of humour, we apprehend, has prevented him from adopting Marx's scheme of a social-labour note-currency which is at once so essential and so chimerical a feature of his creed.

To an optimism like Mr Shaw's, which settles so easily the question of management, the matter of capital offers no difficulty. The credit of the municipality is such, he argues, that it can borrow more cheaply than the private trader. In passing, we might remark that only the larger municipal bodies can now borrow at a cheap rate; and some of them would find it difficult to borrow at all. But, accepting Mr Shaw's statement, we may ask why it is that capital can be borrowed cheaply by municipalities. The answer, we presume, is, because the security is good, because society acknowledges its indebtedness

for all time, and guarantees the principal and interest of the debt. The indefinite extension of this system is an immense boon to the idle capitalist class, or, at all events, to the richer section of it. But the question surely remains: Is the system really cheap to the community? Let us consider a concrete instance.

The estimated capital expenditure for the London County Council's steamboat service is about 300,000*l*. Something presumably must be added for working capital, if, as is inevitable, we still talk in the discredited language of commercial accountancy. The traffic is carried on at a loss of over 53,000*l*. per annum. The 53,000*l*. loss, in Mr Shaw's audit, is compensated by invisible assets, e.g. the contentment, etc., of 300 polite and skilled officials who, being in municipal employment, are, we hope, as well satisfied with their wages and as free from sickness and the other inconveniences of life as Mr Shaw's picture leads us to expect. The steamers, it is generally admitted, go too slowly and unpunctually to suit passengers on business bent; but the account must be credited with pleasant excursions enjoyed by many persons of leisure at a nominal cost. It is difficult to reduce these advantages to figures; and, pending the arrival of the new profession of municipal accountancy, we must be content with the Council's assurance that they more than balance the loss of 53,000*l*. per annum.

To continue, however, the question of the capital involved. A steamboat service on the Thames is a very proper field for enterprise. It has been attempted by more than one set of private capitalists; for hope springs eternal in the commercial breast. They ventured at their own risk; the public had for a while its service of boats; but, as the ultimate result, most of the capital is now resting quietly, a burden to no one, figuratively speaking, at the bottom of the Thames; and no one except the capitalists concerned is a whit the worse. The capital involved in the County Council experiment, on the other hand, remains a debt owed to the well-to-do people who have taken up County Council stock. It will have to be paid, interest and principal, by the ratepayers and taxpayers of the county, and so becomes a permanent burden on the community.

Even in enterprises which are successful the perman-

ence of the value of capital is very limited. The subject is too large to be treated exhaustively here; but a few words are necessary to the logical development of the argument. There are a few but, relatively to the whole, comparatively unimportant items in the category of wealth, which, by reason of the concentrated demand of many, seem to have a permanent and enhanced value. The case of building-land near large cities, and of one or two other things of a similar nature, has attracted great attention and seems to have obscured in men's mind the more general law to which such items are a not very important exception. The security of an investment in land is less than the absolute security of state and municipal loans, while the rapidity, unexpectedness and extent of the growth in value of even city land is much less than what may be seen in many lucky ventures in mines, inventions, and even in such prosaic possessions as bank and insurance shares and works of art. Prospective increases of value in land have been carefully discounted; and we question very much if large profits have been of recent years, or ever will be again, gathered from the purchase of such property. This, however, is a digression, introduced only for the purpose of indicating the source of a prejudice which seems to be running high against one particular class of property—an attitude of mind which exhibits the intelligence of a certain class of politicians at its lowest and most irrational level.

Permanence and progressive increase are not general characteristics of property; and, even in those exceptional cases where it is found, no ground is thereby given for questioning the title of the owner, or (and this is our only point at present) for creating prejudice against the ownership of other forms of capital the value of which is distinctly the reverse of permanent and progressive.

With regard to agricultural land, the evanescent nature of values will be more readily admitted; and few instructed persons will be disposed to dissent from that very competent authority, Mr Albert Pell, when he says 'that value is due to outlay, and that some of the most splendid exhibitions of fertility and agricultural wealth are traceable not to natural circumstances, but rather to the continuous systematic applications of skill and extraneous capital on the soil.' ('The Making of the Land in England,' p. 18.)

In illustration of this opinion, instances are quoted, where, if the sums invested in the improvement of certain estates had been placed in Government securities, the owners would now have been deriving a larger income than they draw from the improved rents of their land, while they would, of course, have still possessed the prairie value of the soil.

In considering the duration of the life of capital in other walks of trade, we have first to remember that a very large amount of capital never makes any return at all to the investor, and that most of the investment which is productive only remains so because it is constantly renewed and refreshed by fresh doses of capital. The disadvantage of this seems to lie entirely with those who adventure the capital, viz. that class of the public which presumably is most able to bear the loss. The advantages belong to the community at large, for whose sake invention is stimulated and the improvement and supersession of antiquated services encouraged. It is not to be supposed that the same spirit of enterprise could or should characterise the work of a municipality which is risking public funds which it cannot write off as bad debts. The same principle is illustrated by the comparative impotence, uselessness, and occasionally absolute harmfulness of endowments. The permanent withdrawal of capital from the control of the living, and its committal to the sterilising grasp of the dead hand, are often not far removed from a public misfortune. The same unavoidable danger seems to attend the proposal to make capitalisation a municipal or national function.

The first step of the municipalising enthusiast, as we understand it, is to warn the private adventurer off those fields of enterprise which for their inception require legislatively conferred way-leaves and franchises; and it need hardly be pointed out that these constitute a very large and increasing proportion of the great industries of the civilised world. Investors who otherwise might have ventured their money in such undertakings are invited instead to take up municipal stock. The whole burden of preserving intact the evanescent value of such investment will be thrown on the rates and taxes. The old channel of relief which lay through the writing-off of the bad debts of industry will no longer be available;

and public enterprise will sooner or later have to face the alternative—of seeing progress brought to a standstill by reason of the burden of indebtedness in respect of improvements of which the value has expired, and of having to decline new fields of enterprise in which the yearly increment of the population might expect to find its profitable employment; or, on the other hand, of repudiating the debt, a course logically demanded by those who regard with abhorrence the existing capitalistic order. Their attitude is quite frank: we are prepared to borrow while it suits us, they say, but we look forward with impatience to the opportunity which must inevitably come of despoiling the public creditor of property which *ex hypothesi* was ill-gotten by him or his forebears.

Our imagination, we confess, is not equal to the task of picturing industry as carried on under the plenitude of socialist principles. At present the services which feed, clothe, house, and convey us from place to place are animated and regulated as a vast series of exchanges. The reward of the organisers in this system, which, be it observed, they do not touch unless their calculation proves successful, is called profit; and, in the main, by their instrumentality supply is adjusted to demand. In the municipalised, nationalised, socialised industry of the future the expectation of profit is no longer to be a guide to production. The demand of the public will be gauged in some other way. Industry presumably will be governed by the principles which govern the supply of the steamboat service provided by the London County Council. Some one in the London County Council has decided that London ought to have 53,000*l.* worth of steamboat service in excess of what Londoners are willing to buy. Some one, in the larger markets, will say how much bread and cheese, how many shirts and hats the community ought to purchase. The only indication which we gather from Mr Shaw as to the limitation of each industry is that each shall be pursued with sufficient activity to give full employment to the workers therein employed. The process seems to be this. First, we make an estimate as to the probable quantities required; then we guarantee employment for the rest of their lives to the labourers engaged. If we complain that too much

industrial energy is being directed to, say, hat-making, we are breeding, *teste* Mr Shaw, a class of auditors who will allay our anxiety by pointing to a more than proportionate profit earned in the high contentment of the latter caste. The intentions of the London County Council with regard to its steamboat service are not fully declared; but obviously it must either go on losing the ratepayers' money at the average of 53,000*l.* per annum, or, if it reverts to the ordinary rules of commerce, it will have to violate one of the first principles of municipal trading, as presented to us by Mr Shaw, and get rid of a staff which is rendering a service that the public does not want.*

We have no wish to trifle with the subject, but in the absence of authoritative exposition of the working of the socialist state we can only succeed in conjuring up conditions which to the plain man seem unthinkable. It is satisfactory to reflect that the advances which socialism is supposed to be making at the polls must oblige its leaders to formulate the constructive side of its designs. M. Jaurès, the leader of the French socialists, has recently attempted an exposition of his creed in the French Chamber, with the result that the French Liberals, as represented by M. Clemenceau, seem to have broken definitely with the socialist party. It is, as we have already pointed out, the liberal school of economics which forms the logical opposition to socialism. We do not use the word in its party-political sense, but as a proper adjective to be applied to a school of thought that accepts liberty in the fullest sense of the term as the keynote of its social and domestic policy.

To whatever party we belong, the problem before us is the same. In view of the natural increase of the population and of the legitimate expectation of an amelioration of their lot among the poorer class, it is absolutely necessary that our trade should be expansive; and for this reason we ought to favour an adventurous use of capital for the creation of new and the extension of old industries. Can municipal trading promise this? Our appeal is to the plain man who perhaps has been

* Since this article was in type, we learn that the steamboat service has been suspended.

sympathetically inclined towards the aspirations of socialism, but who, unless we entirely mistake his attitude, is not prepared to carry out the policy of 'thorough' which Mr Shaw quite candidly puts before us. The halting policy, which is all that public opinion is prepared to sanction, discourages the bold adventuring of capital, and is, we venture to suggest, one cause of the want of employment which is threatening to become chronic. The liberal economist will argue that the expansion of industry required to meet the needs of an increasing and socially progressive population has come in the past, and must come in the future, from the energy of private enterprise. It is therefore for him matter of grave concern to note the discouragement under which private enterprise now labours.

We do not wish to press our logic to an extreme, or to reopen the compact which sanctioned the 'gas and water' policy with which our older municipalities were content; but we are now asked to set this tacit agreement on one side and to drive the private trader out of all industries for which parliamentary powers are necessary; and these, under modern conditions, include almost every enterprise of first-class importance. This last phase of municipal arrogance, inasmuch as it prevents the country from availing itself of the latest discoveries of mechanical science, is of the most far-reaching importance, inasmuch as our half-hearted acceptance of municipal responsibility does not allow the lavish and speculative experiments in capitalisation which the situation requires.

Apart from the theoretical assumption made by the convinced socialist, and by him foisted to some extent on to an uncritical public, namely, that industry can be regulated by a set of fancy balance-sheets such as those above described, we shall find in addition that the public sentiment is much influenced by what we can only call an insane jealousy of profit.

In the *open* markets of commerce, more especially in a free-trade country, profit does not swell largely the cost of commodities. Profit is a deferred payment, only realised when the use of capital and labour and raw material has been paid for in the market. If the organiser can bring his finished commodity or service to a market where it is wanted, he will make his profit, but not

otherwise. Profit is absolutely conditional on public service; and it takes by far the largest risk in industrial operations. It is kept at the lowest possible level by what is variously described as the wholesome rivalry of other tradesmen, or, as some will have it, the internecine struggle of untrammelled competition. Descriptive adjectives vary, but the fact does not seem to be disputed. The reader's satisfaction with this economic machinery will be enhanced if, with the liberal economist, he can accept as a tenet of faith the equity and beneficence of the free market for labour. We have argued in earlier * numbers of this Review, and in explanation of a fact abundantly established by statistical proof, that in the free market the price of commodities tends ever to fall, for the reason that discovery and invention enable production to keep ahead of the demand of an increasing and, on the whole, a richer population; but that, on the other hand, the price of labour has tended to rise, because labour is a mobile force, ever passing, unless hindered by human perversity, from the less to the more remunerative employments. This tendency of the wages of labour to rise can be stimulated by an intelligent acceptance of the elevating influence of the open market, and by a reasonable co-operation with its beneficent purpose.

But the stronghold of the advocate of municipal trading and the denouncer of profit is the alleged injury to the public when a service is carried on by private enterprise under a complete or partial monopoly. Monopoly of old was a usurpation granted by the Crown to an individual or a corporation, or for some plausible reason assumed by the public authority itself; and the profit which is made under such conditions is in reality a tax. It is only in comparatively modern times that monopoly has been granted for the protection and advantage of the public. Monopoly is an evil arising out of a natural limitation of supply, and is only to be mitigated by a choice of evils. To give compulsory powers, under conditions, to railways and telegraph companies seemed preferable either to allowing them to tear up the streets at their will, or to making the public wait for the advantage of railways and telegraphy till the companies could

* No. 407, p. 485; also 378, p. 404.

agree with private owners. No great principle seemed at stake. Gas, water, and sewage were managed by companies or public authorities, as accident decided. Of old time the Government claimed a monopoly in letter-carrying, and later insisted on adding to it the telegraph and the telephone, which seemed formidable competitors. It allows messenger companies, but exacts from them a heavy royalty; and as yet it has made no claim to a monopoly of carrying parcels. The Government makes roads, but not railroads; it is partially responsible for harbours, but not for railway stations. No one invariable principle has been followed.

The difficulty of protecting the public in monopolised services as adequately as it is protected in other services by competition is probably not wholly superable. If, as with the Post-office, the Government constitutes itself sole contractor, it is impossible to say what we may have lost in efficiency. Letters are carried at a profit, but all other branches of post-office work are conducted at a loss; and by common consent we have the worst telephone service in the civilised world. We have not even the consolation that the postal staff is made thoroughly happy.

If next we consider the important service of railways, we shall find that the protection of the public is more effectively carried out by competition, which was supposed to be excluded, than by the regulations of the Board of Trade, though these have been carefully and wisely contrived. To begin with, there has always been competition between one railway and another; roads and canals and sea-carriage are still available; but probably the greatest incentive to diligence in the public service has been the recognised disposition on the part of goods and people to stay where they are unless their movements are encouraged by cheap and attractive conditions of travel. If we consider the fact that there are, as a rule, alternative ways of doing what we want to do, and that much that we want to do may very well be left undone, it will appear that the evil of railway and, indeed, of all monopoly is much exaggerated. Purveyors of service for our luxuries, amusements and necessities compete more or less unconsciously one against another. If fine cognac is dear, we pretend to prefer Scotch whisky; if a holiday

by railway is uncomfortable owing to overcrowding and expense, we take a steamer to Cromer or to Norway. Even if a business journey to Birmingham might seem desirable, the excessive cost of it may decide us to make shift to manage by means of letter or telegram.

Again, it may be questioned whether we have exhausted all the expedients for the protection of the consumer. It was ingeniously argued by the late Sir Edwin Chadwick, notably in an article read before the Statistical Society for January, 1859, that there are many fields of enterprise wherein free competition 'within the field' gives rise to waste and inconvenience (he particularly mentioned the case of our London cab-service); and he suggested that a monopoly of such public services might be handed over to a contractor who had competed 'for the field' (i.e. for the monopoly of rendering some particular service within a given area) under an agreement, subject to periodical revision, and containing proper safeguards in the interest of the public. In his view a careful development, and even extension, of this competition 'for the field' would enable us to secure for the public the advantages of monopoly and private enterprise; and it appears to us that this is a line of experiment which has not yet been fully explored.

Competition 'for the field' is presumably the underlying principle of the right of purchase vested in the public authority in respect of tramways, electric light, and other monopolised undertakings. As a rule, however, the right has been exercised by the municipality itself, only in its own favour—a course which deprives the public of the benefit of competition, and which has many other disadvantages. If the municipality makes a profit, it is a tax on consumers. Why, it is asked, should we be charged too much for our gas or water in order that the authority may give us steamboats or other things, good for our minds and bodies perhaps, but which we do not want at the place and in the quantities that seem fit to our rulers? Or, if the municipalised service results in a loss, as is more usually the case (e.g. houses and steamboats), the loss falls on the ratepayers and taxpayers, most of whom in the poorest class derive no benefit from these municipalised ventures. It is not the very poor who travel on the steamboats; and admittedly it is not the tenants

evicted from slums who inhabit, at an unremunerative rent, the model dwellings which replace them.

Summing up this portion of our argument we may say that the evil of monopoly is very much exaggerated; that regulation for the protection of the consumer is possible; that a closer consideration of the different methods of introducing regulations might even warrant us in increasing the sphere of monopolised industries served by private enterprise; and lastly, that, even if regulation is evaded and a considerable profit is made, the earning of profit is a legitimate incident in industry, and that the existence of a guaranteed investment has a public and general convenience. It is frequently argued, and with some plausibility, that the existence of state and municipal debt has a great advantage as providing financial convenience to banks, insurance offices, provident societies, trustees, and persons responsible for the custody of charitable and similar funds. Stocks representing partially monopolised undertakings offer a field for the investment of such funds which is not open to the objection urged against the municipal capitalisation of industry pure and simple, namely, that municipal debts exist for the advantage of the *rentier* class only, and that they withdraw capital from the risks of competition to which, in the interest of the general consumer, ordinary investment is properly liable.

We have noted the arbitrary manner in which the public authority and private enterprise under regulation have divided the services which it has seemed necessary to regard as monopoly. Clearly, until recently, there has been very little heat in the controversy as to which method was best. It is only with the spread of the socialist propaganda that the point becomes important; and, if the debate were confined to the old narrow area, the matter might still leave us coldly indifferent. Much larger problems, however, are now being raised; and, as illustrative of the difficulties that may arise, the question of the transmission of electrical power may be mentioned as probably the most important. There seems to be very little doubt that, during the century on which we are just entering, electricity is going to supersede steam in many important industries. To claim a monopoly in this new discovery of force is to touch a vital spot in the life

of an industrial nation. The position is comparatively simple.

The economical creation and distribution of electrical power can only be carried out on a grand scale; and for the inception of such enterprise parliamentary powers are needed. The areas of municipalities are admittedly too small to satisfy this condition. Local Government divisions generally have arbitrary boundaries, and do not lend themselves to the advantageous grouping of power-areas. The supply of electrical energy to the mechanical industries of this country is an undertaking of unprecedented magnitude. Not only, it is suggested, can the present uses of steam and gas be largely superseded by the new force, but industries and uses altogether new and unimagined are waiting to be called into existence. Large fortunes will be made, and large fortunes will be lost, in experiments. If we are to feed and find employment for the increasing millions of this country, and to hold our place in the van of nations, we have need here of a lavish and reckless expenditure of money by the captains of the industry.

It is painful, therefore, to be forced to the conclusion that this movement is being strangled in its infancy by the miserable jealousy and self-sufficiency of the municipal monopolist. Municipalities, unabashed by the revelations of municipal incompetence at Poplar and West Ham, are asking that they shall be made the monopolists of a force on which the whole future of British industry probably depends. The impotence of the larger authority, the County Council, for such a task is hardly less marked. The leading spendthrifts of Poplar are influential members of the London County Council. They have overborne the opinion of competent financiers like Lord Welby, the chairman of their own finance committee, and are determined to obtain a monopoly for the supply of electrical energy. Hitherto this dire calamity, which would probably condemn London to gradual but certain industrial decay, has been averted; but, with one or two exceptions, notably at Newcastle, the agitation has succeeded in its dog-in-the-manger policy of defeating all applications from private companies for leave to speculate in this vast field of industry. Meantime we are being overtaken and relegated to an inferior rank among in-

dustrial nations by countries which have found means to evade the rapacity and stupidity of these obstructive tactics. It is not now a question of protecting the helpless consumer; that disguise will no longer serve; the managers of the industrial enterprise of this country do not ask to be protected from the monopoly of private adventurers, but from the incompetence and inadequacy of municipal management.

We have followed the example of Mr Shaw and have discussed the question in its larger aspects. We agree that reference to figures is probably irrelevant when addressed to those who are forcing on this movement. The strength of the party of municipal monopoly is pure fanaticism. Its adherents repudiate accountancy and rely on arguments which hardly seem to touch the ground of common-sense. In Major Darwin's work the reader who desires a more detailed consideration will find a most dispassionate discussion of the merits and demerits of each argument. Like Mr Shaw, he recognises that the appeal to balance-sheets is futile. He suppresses, however, any inclination he may feel to decide the question by reference to a general principle, and considers each allegation on its merits. This procedure will be found most useful for those who are disposed to regard the subject as an open question; but, as we have argued, the whole controversy is overshadowed by the larger issue of whether we are prepared to make a great experiment in collectivism. If we are not prepared for this, municipal trading stands condemned; it can only be logically acceptable to those who regard it as a starting-point for a far-reaching economic revolution which they earnestly desire.

Art. VII.—THE ART-WORK OF LADY DILKE.

1. *The Renaissance of Art in France.* By Mrs Mark Pattison. Two vols. London : Kegan Paul, 1879.
2. *Claude Lorrain : sa vie et ses œuvres.* Par Madame Mark Pattison. Paris : Rouam, 1884.
3. *Art in the Modern State.* By Lady Dilke. London : Chapman and Hall, 1888.
4. *French Painters of the Eighteenth Century.* By Lady Dilke. London : Bell, 1899.
5. *French Architects and Sculptors of the Eighteenth Century.* By Lady Dilke. London : Bell, 1900.
6. *French Furniture and Decoration of the Eighteenth Century.* By Lady Dilke. London : Bell, 1901.
7. *French Engravers and Draughtsmen of the Eighteenth Century.* By Lady Dilke. London : Bell, 1902.
8. *The Book of the Spiritual Life.* By the late Lady Dilke. With a Memoir of the author by the Right Hon. Sir Charles W. Dilke, Bart., M.P. London : Murray, 1905.

THE small band of Englishwomen who, by their writings, have proved that feminine intellect, in its highest development, is on a par with that of man, have had one feature in common. By the bounds which they have imposed on their talent, or by the wider scope which they have given to it, they have shown that, the less extended the area in which they have worked, the greater the excellence of their achievement.

The work of Jane Austen is the produce of a very limited horizon. Most of it was only from thirty to forty years old when Macaulay gave it the high testimonial which, when he wrote it, seemed exaggerated. Now that it is centenarian, it seems as likely to endure as the work of the immortal with whom Macaulay had the audacity to compare her. The small production of Charlotte Brontë, to which death put a premature term, was likewise drawn from a circumscribed area. George Eliot, who stands on a lower level, might have attained the height of her great sisters had she not strayed from her midland villages into the dark conflicts of the Italian Renaissance, and into the gloomier mazes of Anglo-German metaphysic.

These reflections have been prompted by the perusal of the life-work and of the biography of an English-woman who was probably the equal in intellect of any of these three, the last-named of whom was also her friend. The Memoir of Lady Dilke has been written by her husband with admirable tact, dignity, and restraint. Its brevity is likewise to be commended in these days when every departed politician, ecclesiastic, or painter, whatever his mediocrity, is immortalised (for about a month) in two stout and rarely purchased volumes. Indeed Sir Charles Dilke has erred on the side of conciseness. A hundred and twenty-eight short pages are scarcely sufficient for the annals of a life which, for fifty years, from early girlhood, was full of constantly varied and interesting associations. But, brief as the narrative is, it does not fail to convey the impression of the fullness of the life recorded. It is to be regretted that Sir Charles Dilke did not see his way to overcoming the difficulty of giving a bibliography of his wife's writings. No doubt it would have been far from easy to produce a complete one, as, outside the well-known volumes with which Lady Dilke's name is associated, a vast amount of her work is hidden away in reviews, magazines, and other periodical publications. As her biographer remarks, 'It was found impossible to overcome the difficulties caused by Lady Dilke having failed to keep a full list of her contributions to the "Annual Register" and the reviews.'

Had that bibliography been produced, it would have displayed the wide extent of subjects on which Lady Dilke wrote with knowledge and power. In addition to her art-work, historical and critical, with which we are about to deal, and which we consider to have been her true vocation, she was an authoritative and voluminous writer on contemporary European politics. In the later period of her life she developed a delicate faculty for composing mystical parables or romances. In these essays in imaginative philosophy, 'The Shrine of Death,' published in 1886, 'The Shrine of Love' in 1891, and 'The Book of the Spiritual Life,' which was printed posthumously in the same volume as the Memoir, she displayed a wondrous gift of musical prose, which, as one of her admirers wrote after her lamented death, 'seems to partake of the best qualities of the style

of two of her closest friends—it is Pater without his preciosity and Ruskin without his exaggeration.' Some of the most eloquent pages of these occasional writings could have been written only by a profound student of the fine arts and by one who possessed the innate artistic instinct. This is exemplified in a fine passage, too long for us to quote, in the essay entitled 'Of Labour and Learning,' in which Lady Dilke illustrates a theory by a vivid sketch of Eugène Fromentin's life and work in the East; and the same life-like colouring which she finds in Fromentin's writings displays her equally as an artist in the pages she wrote 'Of the Hills and Plains' and 'Of the Woods and Fields.'

Even had a bibliography of Lady Dilke's published writings been made, it would not have supplied a nearly complete account of all her production. Always deeply interested in contemporary politics, during the latter years of her life she devoted much of her time and energy to the organisation of women's labour, which, in no small measure owing to her efforts, has taken a prominent place among the social questions of our time. Even in her earlier days, when she was the wife of the learned Rector of Lincoln College, her sympathy for the toiling members of her own sex had made her come forth from her academic surroundings to urge the necessity for women workers to organise themselves in trade-unions for the purpose of shortening the hours of labour. It was probably with this in view that she was the chief mover in the Oxford branch of the Women's Suffrage Society. From first to last she must have delivered a large number of speeches in furtherance of the causes she advocated.

In the twentieth century it is useless to regret the appearance of women as orators on public platforms. It is a practice which is approved and utilised by all political parties in England. We know not if things have advanced so far that a collection of the flowers of female oratory has ever been published, but if such an eccentric anthology were to appear it would contain few specimens on a par with Lady Dilke's discourses. Their form and delivery were so excellent as almost to banish from the view of an old-fashioned listener the incongruity of the spectacle presented by a refined and personally attractive woman addressing a mixed crowd. But, however

unstudied and facile her eloquence, the matter which it expressed must have represented a vast amount of preparatory exertion. The Memoir by her husband indicates how much time and trouble she devoted to the question of women's trade-unions, in private as well as in her public utterances.

'Lady Dilke has left a women's trade-union notebook in her handwriting . . . In these notes there were laid down those principles of dealing with the labour of women working with their hands which have been universally endorsed by all who received them from her. . . . In her labour notebooks Lady Dilke first took up the case of women in unskilled trades. Avoiding a sensationalism which was repulsive to her trained mind, she pointed out that from the dangerous trades, such as those of the white-lead workers and the match-makers, arose the call to all who valued womanhood to take their share in the improvement of conditions. It was impossible to "sit idly by . . . whilst the anguish of our working sisters and their little ones lifts its voice to Heaven. . . . They are crying to us for their redemption. The seal of death is on their lips."'

'Defuncta adhuc loquitur.' The last words are the post-humous apology, though they were not so intended, of a noble-hearted woman for having sacrificed precious hours and months of a too brief life to a benevolent mission which might have been fulfilled by others, while she left uncompleted the work which was her unique vocation. One of Lady Dilke's familiar friends, whose genial figure appears in the Memoir, was Robert Browning. His name is inseparably associated with that of a woman who did a great work for the suffering poor of her native land. But, if Elizabeth Browning had left her muse in Italy to come home and plead on the public platform or in the committee-room the cause of the friendless little ones, the world would have been the poorer, and she would have accomplished less for humanity than she did in 'The Cry of the Children' and 'A Song for the Ragged Schools of London,' 'written in Rome.' So, if Lady Dilke had been content to devote one day or one week of each busy, beneficent year of her life to composing, in the compassionate prose of which she had the gift, an appeal for the rights of toiling womanhood, she might, without neglecting that cause, have consecrated all her rare power

to a task which she alone of her generation was capable of accomplishing.

This takes us back to the proposition with which we started. Great as is the work of Lady Dilke in the domain of French art, it might have been greater and completer had she never devoted her talent and her strength to other occupations. Even as it stands, her art-work is a remarkable monument. The other women whom we have quoted as displaying mental powers equal to those of men won their fame in the realm of imagination. That of Lady Dilke will rest on her mastery of the positive facts and tendencies of history. For her work was not that of the mere art-critic, whose performance, however attractive or instructive, has no durable value. Her historical instinct, developed by a life-long study of politics, enabled her so to utilise her profound technical knowledge of the fine arts that she made herself a unique authority upon the influence and position of 'Art in the Modern State'—to quote the title which she gave to the most philosophical of her monographs. It was 'the philosophy of æsthetics, the history of art and its connexion with the history of organised and civilised states' that she made the object of her studies. Very rare are the names either of women or of men who could have accomplished her work. Among the former we do not think that England has produced any one capable of doing it. Madame de Staël might have essayed it with success had her training and associations been different. Madame de Sévigné, the greatest of all women writers, whose literary fame is imperishable though she never wrote a book, seems to be the only woman whose learning, breadth of view, and powers of critical observation might have fitted her for a task such as Lady Dilke imposed upon herself.

Before considering the works which have given Lady Dilke her reputation in France as well as in England, it will be interesting to glance at the record of her artistic life as narrated in the Memoir by her husband. Her childhood's home was at Oxford; and it was there, when she was a young girl, that 'her drawings from the Oxford casts were shown to Ruskin, when he was visiting Dr Acland; and it was he who determined her to go to South Kensington to study anatomy.' So to London she went; and old Mulready, who was born before the

French Revolution, was one of the first of her masters. She was a very youthful member of the coterie which used to meet at Little Holland House, where G. F. Watts became her principal adviser; and here she renewed acquaintance with Millais, who had drawn for her a sketch (still extant) of a battle in the year of the establishment of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, when she was a little child. But it was Ruskin who, in her student-days, chiefly influenced her. As years went on she came to differ from him on every point of theory, though their warm friendship endured to the end of his life. In one of his affectionate letters to her after her second marriage, he wrote in 1887: 'To obey me is to love Turner and hate Raphael, to love Gothic and hate Renaissance.' At that time Lady Dilke had for some years been known as the historian of the French Renaissance; and she was then engaged in her more important series of works on what was equally abhorrent to him, the Academic school of the reign of Louis XIV and of the eighteenth century—which showed how far she had departed from her master's dogmatisms. At the same time, there is one principle permeating Ruskin's teaching which undoubtedly sank deep into his pupil's heart and formed the basis of her own view of art. He always preached the relation of art to life; and the development of this idea pervades Lady Dilke's writing.

The first portion of her life, during which the influence of Ruskin had been predominant, came to an end in 1861, when, at the age of twenty-one, she married Mark Pattison. Thenceforward for some years the main influence in her intellectual development was the scholarship of the Rector of Lincoln.

'She widened her conception of art by the teaching of the philosopher and by the study of the literatures to which the schooling of Mark Pattison admitted her. She saw, too, men and things, travelled largely with him, became mistress of many tongues, and gained, above all, a breath of desire for all human knowledge, destined only to grow with the advance of years. The continuity of work which throughout life, for nearly half a century, knew no intermission, and the studies of a powerful mind which never took a day's whole holiday, made possible a survey of the field of knowledge such as has been given to few people in our time.'

We will pass over all speculation as to the extent to which the marriage of the brilliant and beautiful young art-student with a scholar nearly thirty years her senior suggested to George Eliot the Dorothea and the Casaubon of 'Middlemarch.' Nor can we dwell upon the spiritual and intellectual crisis through which the young wife passed by reason of her strangely assorted union. We will refer only to those experiences in her life which concerned her art-work. Travelling in the long vacations with Mark Pattison, she paid two visits to Vienna which had an abiding influence on her work. The mass of notes which she took in the rich museums of the Austrian capital showed that she already had the desire to gain, by hard study, a complete view of the whole field of art and art-history. It is possible that her subsequent specialisation in French art may have been the result of a counsel given to her by the Rector of Lincoln. In later years she thus quoted it: 'It was put before me that, if I wished to command respect, I must make myself the authority on some one subject which interested me.'

'But she never intended to give up her hold upon classical art, and, except when actually absorbed in writing for publication upon the arts in France, she never did so. When ultimately she became known to the French art-world as one of the most serious of students, the praise which she most valued was that of the best-trained intellects of France for the completeness or "universality" of her art-knowledge.'

Though in point of years she had only just quitted her girlhood, she made herself a position among thinkers which is rarely attained by the most venerable of blue-stockings. When she was barely twenty-five she was a regular contributor to the 'Westminster Review,' at that time an important organ of philosophic thought. But her literary labours were not confined to its solemn Benthamite pages. Those were the days when the 'Saturday Review,' still in its sprightly youth, was a power in the land; and from the Rector's Lodge at Lincoln she sent to it a stream of articles, displaying the eclecticism of her mind. A little later her dominant interest in art came to the front; and she became a regular art-critic of the 'Saturday Review,' the 'Portfolio,' and the 'Academy.'

Her divergence from Ruskin was likewise the result of her historical studies. She made fun of some of her master's curious economical doctrines. Steeped in the annals of the Renaissance and of the age of Louis XIV, she told him that his theory that the poor must be well off and sanitary laws be enforced before the arts could flourish was not susceptible of historical proof; she expressed her fear that his 'Social Science Association Arcadia' would be less favourable than he fancied to the production of fine art. Her biographer adds, 'It was a good many years before Ruskin forgave the emancipated disciple; but he ended by completely forgiving her.'

Of this period, when she was attaining her thirtieth year, the Memoir says:

'A review of Herman Grimm' (of Berlin, with whom she carried on a long correspondence in German) 'has a pathetic interest, inasmuch as it opened with a statement of the two great difficulties with which, throughout the art-studies of her life, Lady Dilke found herself confronted. "The student of classic art finds himself in a deserted ruin"; the student of modern art . . . is embarrassed by the abundance of materials: letters, state documents, and biographies. . . . In the one case the student is on the "shifting sands of hypothesis"; in the other he has before him "a mass of materials which no one has yet attempted to bring into shape and order." She was grateful to Grimm for contributing . . . "something towards the commencement of the herculean task." It was this herculean task which she herself attempted, as regards French art, and in which perhaps, more than in any other effort, she wore out her strength.'

No doubt Lady Dilke's study of French art was the severest task which she imposed upon herself. But it was the vocation of her life, needing all her powers; and it was her extraneous work which placed an excessive burden on her physical forces. What wore out her strength was her joining to her life-work an effort to bring about what she might have called a 'Social Science Association Arcadia,' not with any of Ruskin's fantastic illusions, but simply for the purpose of doing good. The aim was laudable; but, life being short and art being long, the result is ever to be lamented.

Among the many men of European fame who recognised her rising authority on French art was one who at

this time had already taken his place in the first rank of critics and of philosophers. In May 1871 Taine came to Oxford to deliver a course of lectures on Corneille and Racine and their times. He had witnessed the first weeks of the Commune in Paris, and it was amid the calm of the classic groves and ancient quadrangles of Oxford that he spent the 'Semaine Sanglante' and heard of the supreme horrors of the insurrection. Tortured with the contrast between these peaceful scenes of immemorial tradition and the condition of his native land, ravaged by war and torn by revolution, he seems to have found his chief consolation in the society of 'une toute jeune femme, charmante, gracieuse, à visage frais et presque mutin, dans le plus joli nid de vieille architecture, avec lierre et grands arbres.'* It was the Rector's Lodge at Lincoln College and its young mistress that the French philosopher so described; and in his letters to his wife he relates how he returned again and again to this quiet corner of old Oxford to solace his patriotic anguish in conversation with this brilliant young Englishwoman upon the imperishable glories of France. For he found out, as he testifies, that she was an authority on painting, and especially conversant with French art; and in a later reference to her he declares his belief in her 'veritable erudition' on the fine arts of the French Renaissance—a compliment worth having from one of the first authorities on that period. In another passage he describes her as a young creature of twenty-six, who works from eight to ten hours a day. As a matter of fact she was then in her thirty-first year; and Taine's miscomputation of her age shows how lightly she bore her burden of learning and diligence—as indeed she did until her life's end.

Taine remarks that she was 'the leading mind'—he uses the English phrase—of the feminine society of Oxford in the domain of art and literature. This incidental testimonial to her position in the University city was a much greater compliment when it was written five-and-thirty years ago than it would be now. Oxford was then in a transitional state; and the recent revolu-

* Taine is not mentioned in Sir Charles Dilke's Memoir. It was after its appearance that Madame Taine, shortly before her lamented death, published the third volume of her husband's correspondence in which his visit to Oxford is related.

tionary scheme of the University Commission was scarcely beginning to effect its work. Fellows were permitted to marry, but the collegiate life of the common-room survived; and the resident graduates had not yet their domestic lives regulated on the lines which prevail in suburban villadom. As a rule the only married member of a college was its head. Hence the womankind of heads of houses and of certain professors constituted the entire feminine society of the University, which contained not a few persons of wide cultivation or social charm. At that time a visit to Oxford was not merely a Sunday on the river for the commonplace Londoner or the wandering American. The strangers who penetrated within the walls of the colleges were often men of European renown. The names which Taine records of the persons he met at Oxford in May 1871 shows how great a compliment he implied in according the pre-eminence to his gracious young hostess of Lincoln College. Oxford society had its limitations, a consciousness of which she did not conceal. The unique position which she made for herself in it, amid circumstances of peculiar difficulty, shows how commanding were her intellectual gifts as well as her ethical and social qualities.

In each period of her life Lady Dilke had the faculty of winning the friendship and the sympathy of the bearers of names which were foremost in Europe in art, literature, and politics. Among those who aided her in her art-work or who admired its achievement was Eugène Müntz, afterwards conservator of the *École des Beaux Arts* and member of the French Institute. He was at work upon his monumental history of the Renaissance; and Lady Dilke's letters to him have been considered of such value that a hundred and fifty of them are preserved in the manuscript department of the *Bibliothèque Nationale*, the correspondence extending over a period of twenty-three years. No testimony is more convincing of Lady Dilke's unique position as an authority on the fine arts in France than the frequent instances of its recognition, in this case official, by the most competent French judges.

'It was George Eliot who first sent Mrs Pattison to Burne-Jones, for though she had long been intimate with the most whole-hearted of his admirers, Watts, and with many of his

friends, she had not, in her early days, visited his studio. The result of her first day among his drawings was a considerable correspondence. . . . George Eliot's letters of 1872 . . . contrast "your virtuous industry" with the writer's "idleness," and allude to the commencement of Mrs Pattison's book on the Renaissance in France.'

Another letter from the same friend throws a side-light on an agreeable private trait of Lady Dilke's character. George Eliot wrote to her at Grasse—whither she had gone to recover from one of those attacks of acute and disabling pain which throughout life constantly interrupted her work—and ended a charming letter by describing her own troubles about settling in a house, and complimenting her correspondent on her 'genius' for domestic economy. Lady Dilke's biographer, in commenting upon George Eliot's compliment, says, with sincere feeling, 'The truth of this will appeal to all who know how, throughout her housekeeping life, the subject of this Memoir succeeded in creating perfect homes.'

We must hasten over the record of Oxford days, full of allusions to her artistic studies and her relations with the world of art. Here she is recognising the talent of Legros and obtaining for him a commission from Prince Leopold, then an undergraduate. A little later she is working at the British Museum with her constant correspondent, Sir Charles Newton, with a view to a handbook on classical art, which project was laid aside owing to the stress of work on the French Renaissance. In 1873 there are letters from Boehm consulting her on questions of sculptural costume; and in the autumn of that year she was appointed art-editor of the 'Academy.' Unfortunately, from our point of view, she had a strong tendency to stray into distracting occupations. In 1877 we are told that 'she came up from Lincoln College specially to attend, as the principal speaker, the annual meeting of the Women's Trade Union League'; and in 1878 she 'was elected a member of the Radical Club, which consisted of twenty members of Parliament, among whom were at that time Mr Chamberlain, Mr Courtney, and Professor Fawcett'—names which do not suggest the Renaissance, the 'Grand Siècle,' or any period in which politicians like Richelieu and Colbert encouraged the fine arts.

Her journey to Italy, which followed the publication of 'The Renaissance of Art in France,' was not open to the same criticism. During a long visit to Rome she was constantly in the society of Italian politicians, but they were persons who, by their instinct and education, were well qualified to aid her in her studies of the relations of the fine arts with the modern state. Sella, the financier, whom she found 'steeped in classical literature,' Bonghi, the eclectic, 'who took her to the Forum,' and Minghetti, who had been associated with Cavour before he became a great party leader himself, were her principal companions. The increasing range of her foreign interests did not make her neglect native art; and a pleasant episode in the Memoir is the account of her relations with Caldecott, whose art was essentially English. Not only did she admire his draughtsmanship, but, as she wrote to him about 'The Babes in the Wood' and 'The Mad Dog,' 'I like to be told stories, and there is no one who has a greater gift that way than you.'

Meanwhile her reputation was growing in France; and Renan, whom she did not yet know personally, 'presented' her 'Renaissance' to the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres. An article which she wrote about this time on Poussin caused Eugène Müntz to urge her to write the life of Claude. This remarkable monograph was written in French, and was published (1884) in Paris, where its success was so considerable that she was almost tempted to produce all her subsequent art-work in that language.

We have dwelt with some detail on the long period of training and study with which Lady Dilke disciplined her vigorous mental powers. The period of mature production had now arrived. Just as in her long years of education she had continually poured forth a copious stream of excellent work, so in her fruitful maturity she never ceased to acquire knowledge. If we have lingered over the earlier portion of her intellectual career, it is to signalise a noble example of self-denying labour for those who come after her. In these days of superficial smattering, when culture is diffused and every one can talk its jargon, it is good to observe the method of one whose Benedictine faculty of work was vigorous in its discipline and powerful in its result.

The year after the publication of 'Claude Lorrain' her marriage with Sir Charles Dilke took place. So prodigious was her activity in the years which followed that the wonder is that a physical frame, often tried with illness, survived for nineteen years. At the time of her second marriage she was engaged on the work on the age of Louis XIV, which was to be published in 1888 under the title of 'Art in the Modern State.' The ten or twelve years which followed the publication of this work were well filled with the preparation of the four magnificent volumes in which Lady Dilke reviewed the complete domain of French art in the eighteenth century. The whole forms a lasting monument of her diligence, learning, and talent. The years devoted to it were none too long, even had its fabrication been the sole occupation of the author. But when one turns from the perusal of these volumes to the Memoir and reads of her daily life crowded with activity in other fields, one is amazed at a woman being possessed of such powers, and regretful that so mortal a strain was laid upon them.

Most gratifying to her in this last period of incessant labour, was the ever-increasing recognition of her position as a great authority on French art by the most eminent men of France. Renan entered, with his wife, into the circle of her most intimate and appreciative friends, in the last years of his honoured career. A friendship not less interesting was that of another illustrious Academician, the Duc d'Aumale, the last of the *grands seigneurs* of France. This brilliant and noble-minded prince had few keener pleasures in the closing years of his life than to entertain Lady Dilke as his guest among the treasures of Chantilly. For, while she was familiar with every work of art which had illustrated the declining years of the ancient monarchy, the venerable son of Louis Philippe had actually known the originals of portraits painted at the Court of Louis XV* nearly a century and a half before. Among Frenchmen of a younger generation who placed her talent very high may be cited M. de Nolhac, the curator of the Palace of Versailles. From the fullness of his knowledge he wrote to Lady Dilke,

* E.g. Charles X, who, as the little Comte d'Artois, was painted with his sister by Drouais in 1763, in the celebrated picture now at the Louvre.

after the appearance of the last volume on the eighteenth century, that she had endowed the literature of art in Europe with a work so considerable and so original that she might now write '*Exegi monumentum*'; and, adds the eminent French critic, '*combien peu parmi nous en aurent rêvé un comparable.*'

We now turn to a brief review of Lady Dilke's principal works in the order of their publication. There is a pathetic interest in writing about the first of these, '*The Renaissance of Art in France*,' as Lady Dilke had intended to give to the public in this very year, 1906, a new and revised edition of that learned work. It was first published in 1879, and is now out of print. It was her hope to bring it out again, made fuller, after a quarter of a century of additional study, and finished with illustrations such as make her volumes on the eighteenth century a joy to possess.

The soldiers of Charles VIII and Louis XII came back to France, after the Italian campaigns which closed the fifteenth and opened the sixteenth century, dazzled with the fertile life of the rejuvenated land. It is from this point that Lady Dilke commences her history of '*The Renaissance of Art in France.*' She shows how the centralising policy of Louis XI had transformed the life of the whole nation.

'The teaching of the Middle Ages, both religious and civil, had inured the masses to passive obedience. To men writhing beneath the exactions of local tyranny, the formidable development of the monarchical power brought a sense of relief; it brought the conception of the king as of one to whom all should be answerable. The same system which was to end by becoming an unendurable burden appeared at first as a means of escape from the cruelty of more immediate oppression. . . . This political change, the shaping of the monarchy, and the centralisation of power, gave considerable impulse to the movement of the Renaissance in the province of Art. The royal court . . . gradually became a centre which gathered together the rich, the learned, and the skilled. Artists, who had previously been limited in training, isolated in life, and narrowed in activity . . . were thus brought into immediate contact with the best culture of their day. . . . The Court made a rallying-point for all, which gave a sense of countenance and protection even to those who might never hope to enter it.'

It was thus that the humanists were able to influence the community with the results of the new learning. Lady Dilke traces their efforts in the architectural revolt against Gothic art. Architecture in its highest forms had been consecrated to two chief purposes, utilitarian and idealistic—the construction of residential strongholds and of churches. The decay of the feudal system and the cessation of its internecine conflicts put an end to the need for powerful nobles to build their houses in the form of comfortless fortresses. As this change was coincident with the decadence of the domination of the Church, architects were called upon to combine their utilitarian with their æsthetic skill, to construct the palace and the château for an intellectually luxurious class which had been extinct in Europe since the removal of the seat of the Roman Empire from Italy to the frontier of Asia.

Lady Dilke says, in this connexion, that ‘great changes of style are always necessitated by some previous change in the conditions of human society and life.’ This is a generalisation which is perfectly true concerning the ages of which she wrote, and remained true until after the French Revolution. But with the greater revolution which began coincidentally with the opening of the Victorian era, when the application of steam, and later of electricity, to means of communication altered the whole current of modern civilisation, the prodigious changes which then took place, and are still progressing, ‘in the conditions of human society and life’ produced no corresponding changes of style. In architecture there is no style which future generations will be able to connote as ‘Victorian’ or ‘Third Republic’ in the sense in which we speak of ‘Renaissance,’ or ‘Louis Quatorze,’ or ‘Queen Anne,’ or even ‘Georgian.’ The interiors of houses have undergone modifications in their sanitary arrangements and lighting appliances; but their exterior aspect and their furniture within display the lamentable fact that the highest achievement of artistic intelligence, in an age unprecedented for diffusion of wealth and of education, is to borrow and to adapt the styles of past ages.

Far different were the results of the Renaissance. After Pavia, palaces and gardens sprang up in France under François I as though by magic. Then it was that

Fontainebleau and Écouen, Chambord, Azay-le-Rideau and Chenonceaux arose, superb monuments which still remain to show how in France the revival of learning and of the fine arts was reflected in the domestic life of an ardent race sprung from old Latin civilisation, which after an interval of a thousand years had suddenly been awakened to the refinements of luxury. Other palaces as sumptuous, such as Anet, and Madrid in the Bois de Boulogne, did not survive the ancient monarchy. Of those which still testify to the splendour and noble taste of the Renaissance, most of the finest examples are found in Touraine or on its borderland. The reason why Touraine became the first centre of the new movement was that it was on the highroad from Italy. This may seem curious to those familiar with the railway system of France, or with the routes which were followed in the eighteenth century. But at the Renaissance many travellers from Rome landed at the port of Narbonne and thence made their way to Paris or to England by Touraine, which thus, by reason of the amenity of its climate and the beauty of its sites, became the favourite residence of the last kings of the house of Valois and their brilliant courts.

One of the most marked and permanent effects of the Renaissance throughout Europe was the disestablishment of the Church as the sole artistic and intellectual influence in the State, as Lady Dilke points out in her highly interesting account of Jean Goujon, whose work we can still admire in the court of the Louvre and at Rouen.

'Up to this moment Goujon's patron had been the Church. From this moment he ceases to work for her. The Church indeed, during the movement of the Renaissance, ceased to occupy the pre-eminent position as mistress of the arts. The development of secular magnificence eclipsed the brilliance of ecclesiastical splendour. Even the monuments which were necessarily erected in sacred buildings had an essentially human character, they were sustained by earthly motives, and spoke of the desires of the flesh rather than of the aspirations of the spirit. The chapel and the tomb were but a part of the fitting furniture of the palace, and as such shared in the general wealth of decoration. Even the princes of the Church, as, for example, Cardinal du Bellay, lavished their revenues, not in raising cathedrals, but in building for themselves "a

lordly pleasure-house." In the service of the great nobles and their chief the artist found the widest scope for his efforts and the richest reward for his labours.'

The emancipation of art from the exclusive service of the Church had one striking effect. Protestantism in the sixteenth century is often associated with hostility to artistic beauty, because the acts of vandalism committed by its agents, in the Wars of Religion in France and in the more peaceful Reformation in England, have impressed the imagination. But Jean Goujon, much of whose noblest work was done for ecclesiastical patrons, was a Huguenot; while Bernard Palissy, the father of the modern fictile art, died a martyr for Protestantism. The mention of the great Huguenot potter reminds us that the architecture of the Renaissance, its most conspicuous monument in France, is only one branch of the artistic movement of that period.

'Princes, prelates, nobles, all were building, fashioning anew their habitations, fitting them for every purpose of manifold life. Out of doors the damask roses and violets of the poets . . . clustered at the feet of marble statues; shady recesses stored the waters of refreshing fountains. . . . Of Meudon, Corrozet tells us "it was a house furnished forth with columns, with busts, with paintings . . . with devices of gold, of blue, of more colours than it is possible to mention." Every art which could minister to house-luxury was, indeed, suddenly stimulated. Tapestry does not appear anywhere in France as a branch of local industry until the middle of the sixteenth century, and then at Tours . . . its manufacture at once took such an impetus that it seemed as if it were going to replace the art of painting. . . . The goldsmiths of Paris eagerly emulated the chased and inlaid work of Milan. The demand for books, for prints, for casts, became more and more general.'

In one respect, however, the Renaissance of art in France lagged behind that of Italy. The painting of that age is so scanty that there are scarcely six French painters of the sixteenth century of whom more is known than the names, at the head of which stands that of François Clouet. It would be most interesting to trace the reasons why this branch of art, so fruitful beyond the Alps, was almost barren in France. This was a subject which Lady Dilke often discussed in conversation; and

had she lived to produce her revised edition of 'The Renaissance,' it is probable that an instructive chapter would have been devoted to it.

The next work of Lady Dilke deals with the period of the consolidation of the nation under the house of Navarre when it came forth from the Wars of Religion. The title of the book, 'Art in the Modern State,' is perhaps too general, as it has no sub-title to explain that this valuable and informing essay treats only of France under Richelieu and in the first period of the long reign of Louis XIV. But the reader is not kept long under any misapprehension. In her first sentence Lady Dilke points out that the France of Richelieu and of Colbert gave birth to the modern state; and that the administrative problems, the social difficulties, and the industrial needs of latter-day communities, were all formulated and instructively dealt with by the rulers of France in the 'Grand Siècle.' This proposition is a tempting subject for discussion. We must be content to give a brief exposition of the main lines of Lady Dilke's treatise.

The main moral principle of the Renaissance was an ideal which had for its end the improvement of the individual. The idea of Richelieu was that the individual counted for little in the development of a people. During the Renaissance the supreme rights of the individual had been carried to an excess; and Richelieu's policy was to guide and to mould the reaction which ensued. The task to which he applied his genius and his energy was to create a unity of purpose in the nation, and to realise the ideal he had formed of collective action which should lead to national greatness. The principle of absolutism, which for two centuries after Richelieu dominated the social and political world of continental Europe, took its rise from his ideal of the State. Although he was an ecclesiastic and the servant of the monarchy, his oppressive policy was not conceived and carried out from his devotion to the Church or his reverence for the throne. Protestantism had to be put down and the power of the great nobles to be broken solely for the purpose of welding all the forces of the nation into one irresistible machine. The glory of letters and the fine arts, as also the development of trade and industry, were pursued as factors of national grandeur. His policy in attaining

this end was neither that of a personally ambitious statesman, nor of a courtier, nor of a churchman. He cared little for Louis XIII, and would have been the last to place France under the domination of Rome. His ambition was not for himself but for his nation; and that ambition had only one end—it aimed at making the State strong by means of its united forces. 'He ruthlessly destroyed all life and liberty the existence of which was incompatible with regular growth. No cruelty was too pitiless, no treachery too base, if required to maintain the pressure necessary to force into even channels all the springs of national energy. So in the accomplishment of this policy he forced learning and letters and the fine arts to put on a royal livery, that is, the uniform of the State, as the price of existence.'

We cannot stay to note the most conspicuous achievement of Richelieu in this direction, the constitution of the French Academy, which fostered a noble literature 'characterised by the lustre of intelligence rather than by warmth of feeling,' but which brought the French language to a supreme degree of purity, lucidity, and brilliancy, and established it as the first of all modern organs to express human thought. The action which Richelieu 'had taken in respect of literature was destined to be extended to the sciences and the arts. All the forces of thought, all the energies of labour, were now ready to be held by similar ties to the administration, to accept popular tasks and to conform to an officially recognised standard of excellence. This part of his work the Cardinal was not destined to complete.' It was Colbert in the succeeding reign who, in the domain of the fine arts, completed the policy initiated by Richelieu.

The discovery of Colbert by Mazarin, followed by his dying recommendation of him to Louis XIV, was the greatest service rendered to the State by the guardian of the minority of the young king. The finances of the kingdom had fallen into disorder under the rule of the Italian Cardinal and the administration of Fouquet, who, originally his creature, was plotting to overthrow him when he died. The arrest of Fouquet for malversation took place in 1661 at the Château de Vaux, near Melun; which remains the most superb monument of seventeenth century domestic architecture in France. It was the

period from that date until the death of Colbert in 1683 which gave the 'Grand Siècle' its right to its name. The organiser of the financial system, the creator of the French navy and of the export commerce of France, the projector of a French empire in the Far East, was also the founder of the Academy of Painting, of the Academy of Architecture, and of the School of France at Rome.

'To the pure pleasures of art Colbert was as indifferent as Richelieu himself: he saw, however, not only its value as a means of national glory; he was also the first to appreciate the immense services which it might be brought to render to national industry. . . . To Colbert, therefore, is due the honour of having foreseen, not only that the interests of the modern State were inseparably bound up with those of industry, but also that the interests of industry could not without prejudice be divorced from art.'

While rendering this tribute to Colbert and to the 'Grand Siècle,' Lady Dilke does not disguise her preference for the Renaissance. She finds the work of the 'Grand Siècle' monotonous. 'Since none but the king could give employment, all that was made was made to please him, and his tastes were those whose ideals were wholly external.' Walking in the deserted terraces of Versailles, 'what is the message,' she asks, 'that comes to us from this ruin of royal things? What is there left to-day of the great king and of that virtue excelling the virtue of all other kings in which Colbert would fain have believed? An empty pleasure-house haunted by memories of lust and insolence and greedy self.' If we had the space we should like to criticise this passage. But the existence of this book, 'Art in the Modern State,' inspired by this period, is Lady Dilke's own criticism of it. We will let her answer herself with another passage in the book.

'At Versailles Le Brun, for whom the title of First Painter had been revived, took command of all the works of decoration, whether sculpture or painting. Over the whole palace his rule was supreme, and all other artists had to accept the position of his assistants. Imagine the situation of Sir Frederick Leighton . . . having under his hand the Board of Works and several great national manufactories, as well as the biggest building in the world to decorate and furnish

royally. Sir John Millais would of course sulk off somewhere else, as Errard did to Rome; Mr Herkomer would go to New York, perhaps, and found the school of the future. . . . Imagine the President (if you can) producing several vast historical paintings a year, furnishing the designs which Hook and Horsley, Fildes, Calderon, Poynter, Frith and Goodall, Faed, Long, Orchardson, everything, in short, that writes itself R.A., would be sworn to carry out or starve; whilst Boehm, MacLean, and Gilbert competed for the chance of embodying his projects for the sculptured decorations of halls and gardens.'

Lady Dilke was no doubt making fun of the Royal Academy, as we have seen she did of her master, Ruskin. But, whether the passage be serious or sarcastic, it is a splendid tribute to the art of the 'Grand Siècle' compared with that of the last generation of English art. For, with the exception of three or four names in her list of our Academicians, it is a catalogue which indicates almost the low-water-mark of art in a land which in the past had produced at least two great schools of painters. England, whether from the stimulant of knowledge or of fashion, has awoke to this fact, as is shown by the depreciated commercial value of the wares of most of these Academicians when offered for public sale in the twentieth century. Lady Dilke knew very well that, if the Royal Academy in the reign of Victoria had been pressed into the service of the State to decorate a palace of that epoch, which itself would have been a monstrosity, the result could have only been painful to future generations. But the work of the craftsmen recruited by Le Brun is, even in its inferior examples, stately and sumptuous, and an education to those who study it at the present day. A lover of the Renaissance may dislike it, but only as a votary of Gothic may in turn be displeased with the Renaissance. We must however bear in mind that Lady Dilke criticised from a standpoint to which few of her most cultivated readers can hope to attain. She was as familiar with the history of the 'Grand Siècle' as she was with that of the French Renaissance; and, when she criticises the art of Louis XIV, it is not as an Englishwoman of the nineteenth century, but as one who had lived and moved in the society which, under the last kings of the house of Valois, filled the valley of the Loire

and the region of the capital with the noblest products of the new culture in its unspoiled youth.

It is from a different standpoint that Lady Dilke criticises the age of Louis XIV, when she contrasts the splendour of Versailles with the misery of the peasant. No one can have lived and worked in France under the Republic without being influenced by the attitude of modern historians and philosophers who spend their lives trying to prove that there was little that was meritorious in France before 1789. Lady Dilke's later volumes are a magnificent monument to the glories of pre-revolutionary France. But her democratic and philanthropic sentiments make her sensible to the fact that the inordinate extravagance of the Court was producing in the nation economic causes which a century later were to sweep away the monarchy and ameliorate the lot of the poor. Yet the 'Grand Siècle' was not the only age in which the misery of the toiling class was very harsh. The peasants under Louis XIV and his successor were not more unhappy than many of the labouring classes of Chicago or thousands of our own poor of London. For, while the Revolution did something to help the French peasant, the greater material revolution which has taken place since has engendered inequalities in all civilised lands as grave as any of those of the ancient regime. Whatever the abuses of the old monarchy, it produced works of art and of literature which still solace and educate humanity, while it trained a leading race in perfection of form and style for the lasting benefit of mankind. Our age has no such compensations to offer to the future for the continued and perhaps aggravated misery of the poorer classes in the present.

This slight criticism detracts nothing from the value of Lady Dilke's work, for it indicates a highly interesting feature of her writings. They are not only full of information and learning, but they make her readers think for themselves and reflect upon the causes of the movements which changed the face of Europe and the current of civilisation in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. We part with reluctance from 'Art in the Modern State,' which is an essential introduction to her series of monographs. One of its chapters deals with the struggle for privilege between the new Academy of Painting and the

guild of master-painters, which upheld the pretensions of the corporations, more ancient than the Renaissance. This controversy is again dealt with in her life of 'Claude Lorrain,' one of the two or three French books which since the Revolution have been written by English people and widely read in France.

After the barrenness in painting of the French Renaissance, the early years of the seventeenth century saw the birth of a number of great masters in that art. Four of them stand in the very first rank. There was Poussin, the father of French landscape painters, of whose power of composition Lady Dilke wrote, in one of her many uncollected articles, 'it is purely academic in character, but stands in the highest class of its kind, and, like every great exercise of human intelligence, has its just claim on our accurate appreciation.' He died in 1665, so he saw only the opening of the 'Grand Siècle.' There was his pupil Lesueur, who died before his prime ten years earlier. His twenty-two pictures representing the life of Saint Bruno are unsurpassed for colouring and draughtmanship, though little justice is done to them at the Louvre, where, unlike the masterpieces of Poussin, they are badly hung. There was Le Brun, who likewise was a pupil of Poussin, and who, as we have seen, was the arbiter and the dictator of the fine arts under Colbert. Finally, there was Claude Gellée, commonly called Lorrain, being born in Lorraine, whose life filled nearly the whole of the century. He remains the first of French landscape painters, and is known in France as 'le peintre de lumière.' Lady Dilke attributes his excellence in this line, in an age in which the best talent of France was pressed into the service of the king for decorative work, to his long sojourn in Italy far from the circumscribing influences of his native land. When Colbert protected the painters against the domination of the *maîtrise*—the guilds which we have mentioned—it was not to give them liberty. The 'protection' of the king took the place of the tyranny of the guilds, and produced the Academic school. Lady Dilke thought that the greatest honour of Claude was, among the artificiality of mid-seventeenth century art, to have seen a corner of wild nature, to have 'plunged into the wood, and lost himself in the contemplation of distant horizons.'

Before leaving this attractive volume, sumptuous with its wealth of engravings, we will quote a passage which displays at the same time Lady Dilke's mastery of her subject and her remarkable facility in writing the French language in all its elegance and purity.

'On a reproché à Claude d'être le père du paysage académique; notre maître avait, il est vrai, la passion des belles lignes librement écrites, mais il évita les écueils du glacial paysage linéaire, grâce à son amour de la lumière et de la couleur, grâce au charme de l'indéfini, dont il fut, comme tous ceux que se plaisent à rêver, profondément pénétré. . . . Sa passion pour la lumière et pour l'air aurait suffi pour donner à son œuvre un accent de poésie, même sans la tendance qui l'a toujours porté à chercher dans l'image de la nature les vibrations de l'âme humaine. En parcourant la campagne seul du matin au soir, Claude a surpris la vie intime de la nature et a partagé ses plus secrètes agitations; il les a vues se refléter au plus profond de son être. . . . Jamais la solidarité de l'homme et de l'œuvre n'a été plus complète que chez Claude.'

We now come to the series of magnificent volumes which Lady Dilke completed in the last years of her life, and by which she will always be remembered so long as the triumphs of French art in its most gracious period are admired by English students and prized by English collectors. We have deliberately left ourselves little space to deal with them, for they are books to possess rather than to criticise. In the fullest sense of the old phrase, no gentleman's library ought to be without the large-paper edition of the 'Painters,' the 'Architects and Sculptors,' the 'Furniture and Decoration,' and the 'Engravers and Draughtsmen' of the eighteenth century. For the collector they are beyond value. But every lover of art ought to possess the series, so that when he has been to the galleries of the Louvre or of Hertford House, or has visited some English country-house containing French pictures, sculpture, or furniture of the eighteenth century, he may return home and learn the history of the treasures he has seen and of their creators, or understand in what their beauty and perfection consists. For there is more technique and less philosophy in this series than in the smaller English works of Lady Dilke.

Although it was not her favourite, the volume devoted

to the painters will always be the most popular. It not only tells us all that is to be known of the French masterpieces of the last generations before the Revolution, but it is lavishly illustrated with admirable reproductions of fourscore of some of the best and the most inaccessible. Only about a dozen of the pictures reproduced are at the Louvre and in other museums equally easy to visit. The great majority are in the distant galleries of Stockholm, Dresden, and Berlin, or in private collections in Paris not open to the public. In turning over these pages, which give some idea of the incomparable grace of Greuze and Nattier, of the dignity of Drouais, of the vigorous grouping of Lancret, de Troy, and van Loo, of the romantic composition of Boucher, Fragonard, and Watteau, the genius of the eighteenth century at the Court of France passes before our eyes, and we can thank Heaven that the ancient monarchy was allowed to remain until the end of the era of the picturesque in clothes.

Lady Dilke does not neglect the philosophical aspect of the history of art, though it is less prominent than in her small treatises. She continues to trace the influence of the State on art in a manner which makes us regret that her work comes to an end with the French Revolution. She shows how, and why, the work of the eighteenth century differed alike from that of the Renaissance and of the 'Grand Siècle.' Of the former she says:

'The marvels of the French Renaissance, the portraits of the Clouets, the enamels of Limoges, the stained windows of St Gervais and Vincennes, the sculptured tombs of St Denis, the châteaux of Touraine, the illustrated books of Paris, of Rouen, and of Lyons, say little to us of personal luxury and much of the love of beautiful things. The arts of France in the days of the Regency, and in the reigns of Louis XV and Louis XVI, speak to us of a personal luxury to which things beautiful were as servants.'

We are not quite sure about this. Agnes Sorel and Diane de Poitiers were not less fond of luxury than Madame de Pompadour and Madame du Barri; and François I in that matter was a worthy ancestor of the Regent and of Louis the Well-beloved. There was less comfort during the Renaissance than in the eighteenth century; but that arose from want of experience, not

from lack of desire. There is no doubt that the last period of the ancient monarchy was, for the privileged, delightful to live in. Lady Dilke, with all her theoretical admiration for the Revolution, comes under its spell. Her distaste for the 'Grand Siècle' is evidently sincere, and it seems to arise from a sort of resentment at the collapse of the Renaissance, which ought to have produced an æsthetic millennium had the movement not come to a premature end. But Lady Dilke falls completely under the charm of the eighteenth century.

'The glories of the reign of Louis XIV were the product of a system which, having assigned to each group of workers their proper function in the State, bid the artist make, not things beautiful, of which he should have joy in the making and others in the possessing, but that which should present an imposing show befitting the service of the King. . . . The men who succeeded them, and who revolted from their rule, like the men of the Renaissance, wrought those things that they and their fellows loved and desired, and, working with delight, they still delight us. Nay, more, they show us the very hearts of men. . . . That is why this art, which the dead of the eighteenth century have left us, is justly dear in our eyes. It is a genuine manifestation of human energy, and therefore it is to be held sacred.'

In the 'Architects and Sculptors,' which succeeded the 'Painters,' Lady Dilke followed the system she had adopted in the latter work. She chose out those men who seemed to have most forcibly influenced art, and from their work took examples illustrating the nature of that artistic development which corresponded to the renewal of human ideals whereby the eighteenth century was distinguished. Architecture occupies only a small portion of the volume. The majority of the examples given are taken from Paris—Sainte-Geneviève (the Panthéon), Bagatelle, the Palais de la Légion d'Honneur, the École Militaire, the north end of the Place de la Concorde, the Place Saint-Sulpice, and the Hôtel de Soubise (Archives Nationales). The centralising influence of the Court had brought the noble and the wealthy to the capital and to Versailles, leaving their estates neglected. Consequently the construction of fine châteaux in the provinces almost came to an end in the eighteenth century. But building went on in the provincial capitals, witness the theatre of

Bordeaux—still the most imposing monument in south-western France—and the noble Place Stanislas at Nancy.

In sculpture Lady Dilke seems to be of opinion that the eighteenth century was superior to the Renaissance—the greatest compliment which she could pay to it. She points out that, during the Renaissance and during the reign of Louis XIV, the conditions under which the sculptor worked were to some extent identical, as he was mainly occupied with work of a more or less monumental or architectural character; and she adds that the French are great sculptors because they are great architects. The sculpture of those days was thus regulated by its surroundings; but the spirit of independence, which marked the emancipation from the Academic school, gave birth to the wish, among artists, to express their own personality. Consequently the eighteenth century saw the triumph of the statue. To show how fruitful was this age in plastic art, we have only to mention the names of Coustou le Jeune, the author of the famous 'Chevaux de Marly,' of Pigalle, and of his pupils Houdon and Clodion. The work of the medallist is the sister craft of sculpture. It has never risen to any great height in our country, but in France it still flourishes. It, at all events, was an art which owed its perfection to royal patronage. One of the most magnificent books of the early eighteenth century is the great volume containing engravings of all the medals struck during the long reign of Louis XIV. So important was this branch of art that the Academy of Inscriptions, which still remains the classical section of the French Institute, was founded by Colbert in 1663 primarily for the purpose of superintending the striking of medals and of composing Latin inscriptions to signalise the events commemorated. The examples of the medals struck under Louis XV and Louis XVI, engraved in Lady Dilke's volume, show how well the Academy continued to fulfil its functions.

It is said that Lady Dilke considered her volume on 'Furniture and Decoration' in some respects the most important of the series. No other branch of art reflects more faithfully the life of the age; none is more difficult to treat systematically. The expressions 'Louis Quinze' and 'Louis Seize' have entered into the ignorant jargon of the upholsterer throughout the civilised world; but,

as Lady Dilke points out, even on the lips of experts such phrases are merely convenient terms to connote certain tendencies, so long as no strict chronological meaning is attached to their use. In these days of the diffusion of wealth and luxury, this volume should be in the hands of every one who possesses or wishes to acquire articles of furniture which date from the time when Madame de Pompadour's fine taste directed the artists employed by the Crown, and when the activity of the royal factory of the Gobelins was resumed in 1736.

We have no space left for the concluding volume on the 'Engravers and Draughtsman,' except to make one observation. In some respects it is the most satisfactory of the series as regards its illustrations, because it has been possible to reproduce the treasures of the Cabinet des Estampes, and of other collections of engravings, almost in the identical form in which they were created. This is especially true of the large-paper edition of the last-published volume.

Such is the art-work which Lady Dilke has left us. Incomplete as it is, for reasons which we have indicated and regretted, it is a splendid legacy and one absolutely unique as coming from the hand and the brain of a woman. Future generations of English students will be able to have recourse to some of the material of which she made such admirable use. Sir Charles Dilke and her executors, knowing her munificent desire, have presented to the Victoria and Albert Museum at South Kensington her art library, consisting of 630 works, including many rare and priceless editions. In studying her series of published volumes, traced out on one systematic plan, our regret has been very deep that our guide should quit us on the threshold of the French Revolution, which brought in its wake a revolution in the fine arts and likewise a complete change in the relations of art to the State. We would have given much to have had Lady Dilke to trace the influence of the neo-classicists, with David at their head, who sketched with ferocious pencil Marie Antoinette on her way to the scaffold, and painted with the gorgeous complacency of a revolutionary courtier Napoleon in his pomp. What would Lady Dilke have said about Horace Vernet, Isabey, and Gros? We know a little of what she thought of Ingres, whom

she studied at Montauban in the museum which, with every other provincial museum in France, was familiar to her. But what new lights might she not have thrown on Corot and the school of Barbizon, and the influence of Constable on the landscape painters of the monarchy of July? A little later she might have explained the architecture of the Second Empire, when Baron Haussmann was decreed by Louis Napoleon to be the Le Brun of the boulevards.

Yet, though this has not been done, we are thankful for what Lady Dilke has given us, and proud that her work was accomplished by an Englishwoman. Considering that it was conceived and executed by one who was never physically robust, who was never secure from prolonged attacks of acute bodily pain, who had known private sorrows enough to disable a less courageous soul, whose occupations in other lines were sufficient to fill the life of an ordinary man, the result is astounding. It is a noble example to those who come after her, whose praise will be rendered to her in the words of her old master, Ruskin, which stand on the first page of her Memoir: 'The path of a good woman is indeed strewn with flowers, but they rise behind her steps.'

Art. VIII.—THE CHEAP COTTAGE.

1. *In Search of a 150l. Cottage.* London: Office of 'The County Gentleman,' 1905.
2. *The Book of the Cheap Cottages Exhibition.* London: Office of 'The County Gentleman,' 1905.
3. *Country Cottages.* London: Heinemann, 1905.
4. *Modern Housing in Town and Country.* By James Cornes. London: Batsford, 1905.
5. *The Model Village and its Cottages: Bournville.* By W. Alexander Harvey. London: Batsford, 1906.
6. *A Book of Cottages and Little Houses.* By C. R. Ashbee, M.A. London: Batsford, 1906.
7. *Journal of the Royal Sanitary Institute.* Margaret Street, London, W.
8. *Journal of Estate Clerks of the Works.* 88 Victoria Street, London, S.W.

A LADY visitor to the recent Cheap Cottages Exhibition, having had it explained to her, in response to a question, that the concrete house she had just been over was built of cinders and cement, eagerly enquired whether, if she had the cinders from the fires of her own house saved, she could have a country cottage built of them. Ignorance almost as remarkable has undoubtedly characterised not a little of what has been written in the public journals and spoken on public platforms during the past twelve months or so in regard to the problem of inexpensive cottage-building. We cannot feel, however, that such ill-informed deliverances are wholly unsatisfactory; they show at least that a technical subject of great importance has begun to interest the public. Until the holding of the much criticised Cheap Cottages Exhibition, most newspapers seemed a little afraid of boring their readers with the problems to which the Building Bylaws Reform Association, the Rural Housing and Sanitation Association, and many public-spirited landowners, land-agents, and architects would fain have attracted their attention.

Before colonising can begin there must be houses for the colonists. In the colonising of rural England, from more than one class of the community, which is surely not the least pleasant feature of our social history during the last few years, there was bound to come a time when

the demand for cottages would exceed the supply. The new-comers to the country were also quick to see, and the world at large soon got to know, that the housing of the aboriginal inhabitants of the shires was in many cases capable of improvement.* And as neither the landlords of the original cottages nor the would-be cottagers from the towns were particularly well-off, a desire on the part of both to employ the simplest and least costly building methods was natural enough.

There is no insurmountable difficulty in getting money for cottage-building. The landowner can borrow from land investment companies, through the Board of Agriculture, at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. for sums of 500*l.* upwards, and 4 per cent. for sums below that amount.† The *émigrés* from the towns have either savings, or the building societies, or organisations like the Small Holdings Association to fall back upon. But, whoever pays the builder's bill, the expenditure which has been incurred has to be met in the form of rent. And so long as the wages of the agricultural labourer and the budget of the 'Back-to-the-lander' are what they are, there must be rigid limits to the amount of the rent. The problem, as it affects Hodge, has never been more clearly stated than by Mr St Loe Strachey, editor of the 'Spectator,' and the originator in another of his papers, the 'County Gentleman and Land and Water,' of last year's exhibition of cheap cottages at Letchworth, to which the Duke of

* But there is the way in which the matter presents itself to farmers and landowners to be considered. A farmer said to the present writer: 'Take that cottage there. It's at least water-tight. There's a large garden. You could turn a horse and a cart in their living room. There's ample accommodation in the house for the man, his wife, and three sons on full wages. All the rent they pay is 1*s.* 6*d.* a week. Even if the place had faults it isn't paying a fair interest on capital, and Higgins's married son in London is paying six times as much rent as his father for a home not half as good.'

† In other words, a landowner can have 500*l.* of new cottage property, as soon as it can be built, for an annual 7*l.* 3*s.* 0*d.* per cent. (sinking fund included) for twenty years. Unfortunately the Board of Agriculture will at present pass loans on 'brick, stone, or other incombustible material' only. It has not yet learnt that steel studding, expanded metal and plaster, for instance, make a much more incombustible house than the average brick house. Lord Carrington, as a skilled cottage-builder, will no doubt be disposed to reconsider this inconsistent attitude. There is also the question whether in some cases loans on wooden houses might not be justifiable,

Devonshire and other public men so deservedly gave their moral and financial support.

'Why are there so few cottages being built in the country, and why is no proper provision made for housing the rural labourers? The answer is simple. It costs more to build a cottage than the labourer can afford to pay in rent. Practically an agricultural labourer, even if he is in constant employment, cannot afford to give more than 3s. a week for a cottage, or 8*l.* a year; and this, under existing conditions, is not enough to pay interest on capital, rates, insurance, and repairs. At present a cottage in the country with a garden, which is essential, costs, not counting the land on which it is built, and making the smallest possible allowance for fencing and laying out the site and providing the water supply, at the very least, 250*l.* . . . But 4 per cent. on 250*l.* means 10*l.* per year; rates account for another pound; and insurance and annual repairs must be placed at at least a pound. Therefore, even if nothing is put for depreciation and management, it is impossible to make cottage-building pay even a very moderate return unless the cottage, when built, will let for at least 12*l.* per year. . . . The next question is—Is it possible to build a 150*l.* cottage which, not counting anything for the site or water supply—which on many estates the landowners would be willing not to take into consideration in the rent—can be let for 8*l.* a year? A 150*l.* cottage might just be let for that. Interest on capital would account for 6*l.*; and rates, annual repairs, sinking fund, and insurance for 2*l.* At present, however, it is the almost universal testimony of landowners that a cottage such as the labourer rightly now demands, with three bedrooms, a living-room, kitchen, and a scullery, cannot be built for 150*l.*'*

The correctness of Mr Strachey's statement of the situation could not be more forcibly illustrated than in the

* The criticism made upon this plan that five rooms do not include a parlour is ridiculous if cottage-building is to be looked at from a business point of view. It would be more to the purpose to suggest that instead of five rooms, four or even three might be reckoned adequate for labourers without families. It is preposterous to expect a landowner who has to live on his rents to provide rooms for all his labourers to keep lodgers in.

We may quote in this connexion from the words of the author of 'A Book of Cottages,' who is, we believe, a socialist: 'You are building for a man who is filled with fresh air. The labourer has not the townsman's essential needs. Air, light, height, size, space, and sanitation are not such important matters as they are for his town brother; and they certainly do not demand such close and fussy regulation.'

following letter from a philanthropic landowner which is now before us:—

'I appeal to you for any assistance under the following circumstances. I am an unfortunate landowner in this Lake district, where cottages are sorely needed for labourers on the land. The evil of famine for cottages for labourers here has become much intensified of late years by the fashion of town-dwellers grabbing every cottage that is to be had to use only as a holiday home for summer sunshine. Thus resident labourers cannot find homes, as they cannot compete with town fortunes, and landlords let to the highest bidder. Building here is expensive all round, and from 300*l.* to 400*l.* is the lowest we can build locally with our rubble, stone, and slate. For a cottage, when done, our labourers cannot afford to pay more than 3*s.* per week rent. Now to my point. I wish to try the experiment of an iron and wood cottage, four-roomed to cost 150*l.* and no more. I have a gamekeeper who is a steady, good fellow. He is engaged to marry our cook early in New Year. Not a possibility of a cottage can he find. . . . His gladness at my suggestion that I might put up a cottage was good to see.'

Cottage-building has become more expensive for several reasons. In the first place, there has been a rise, not only in the price of labour* and some classes of materials, but in the labourer's standard of comfort. Secondly, there are building bylaws in many districts which insist on a dwelling of such a plan that a greater expenditure is necessary upon it than has been customary in the past. Lastly, the wisest decision has not always been made as to design and materials. Whatever the Cheap Cottages Exhibition did not do, it demonstrated that a considerable saving could be effected by economical planning and the utilisation of the materials nearest at hand; it proved that certain building bylaws were indefensible in regard to isolated dwellings in a rural district; and it enabled a considerable number of interested people to obtain an insight into the actual cost of the materials of which a cottage is composed. It was not for nothing that a builder at the Exhibition was heard to deplore the fact that the public was 'getting to know too much.'

* Without a corresponding rise in efficiency or output. This is one of the chief causes of expensive building.

One of the objects of the Exhibition was to find, if possible a five-roomed cottage, not costing more than 150*l.*, apart from builder's profit, architect's fee, and—two items which necessarily vary in every district—cost of land and cartage of materials. This object would seem to have been attained. The Exhibition, as Mr Strachey has written,

'resulted in showing conclusively that a cottage, suitable to what I may term the highest needs of the agricultural labourer, can be produced for 150*l.* by those who do not wish to make a profit out of the building, and merely have to consider the out-of-pocket expenses of construction. The landlord, that is, who wants to increase the housing accommodation on his estate, and who is willing not to consider the price of land or the supervision given by himself or his agent, can, it has been proved by the Exhibition, erect an extremely comfortable house for 150*l.*' *

Let us examine the evidence on which this statement, the accuracy of which has been called in question, really rests. In the first place, the various cottages were erected by their builders and architects, not only under the eyes of rivals, but under the close daily scrutiny of a skilled and responsible clerk of the works, employed by the committee. Secondly, each competitor had to submit to this clerk of the works and the committee, both acquainted with current prices, a schedule, with accounts attached, showing his expenditure in detail. Thirdly, the prizes were awarded, after a succession of visits to the cottages, before and after completion, by judges who included architects so eminent as Messrs W. R. Lethaby, R. W. Schultz, and Thackeray Turner, a sanitary expert like Professor G. Sims Woodhead, and no less an authority on working-class dwellings than Miss Octavia Hill.

That all the cottages erected at the Exhibition cost only 150*l.* no competent visitor would believe. But, if the builders of certain dwellings chose to disqualify themselves for prizes by exceeding the financial limit set them, and were content to advertise themselves by means of 'arty and crafty' or other devices, that was their own affair. There was, however, at Letchworth, without

* The cost of sinking wells, an expense which, however, has not always to be incurred, is the only item omitted by Mr Strachey.

question, a number of cottages the expenditure on which, within the limits set out in the official conditions, did not exceed 150*l*. Of these, three received prizes of 100*l*., 50*l*., and 30*l*. respectively. Among the pairs of five-roomed cottages, three, ascertained to have been erected at a cost not exceeding 300*l*., obtained awards of 50*l*., 30*l*., and 20*l*.

We give summaries of the details of cost of the first three of these half-dozen cottages, particulars which are now published for the first time.

A Cottage: Brick, rough-cast. The whole site is covered with concrete. Outside walls 9 inches, inside 4½ inches, with two coats of plaster. The roof is covered with sand-faced tiles. The cottage comprises a large living-room, scullery, larder, etc., and three good bedrooms, containing 2960 cubic feet.

	£	s.	d.
Excavator and concreter	4	14	0
Bricklayer (including rough-cast and ranges)	59	15	6
Tiler	12	8	8
Mason	0	14	0
Carpenter and joiner	43	6	0
Ironmonger	5	4	0
Plasterer	9	17	0
Plumber and glazier	6	12	3
Painter and decorator	6	0	0

£148 11 5

B Cottage: Part brick and part timber. Nine-inch brick walls to first floor on two sides; remainder 4 inches by 2 inches, timber framing, covered outside with weather boards, inside with lath and plaster. The roof is covered with sand-faced tiles. The cottage comprises a large living-room, scullery, good porch, larder, etc., and three bedrooms, containing 2396 cubic feet.

	£	s.	d.
Excavator and concreter	5	5	2
Bricklayer (including ranges)	37	8	0
Tiler	13	8	0
Carpenter and joiner (including ironmongery)	57	17	2
Smith	2	15	8
Plasterer	11	0	0
Plumber and glazier	7	14	0
Painter and decorator	10	1	0

£145 9 0

C Cottage: Concrete, having the whole site covered with concrete. Outside walls 7 inches of solid concrete, rough-

cast outside. Inside walls 3 inches solid, plastered with cement and sand. All walls reinforced with steel rods. Roof covered with Bridgwater tiles. The cottage comprises living-room, scullery, washhouse, larder, etc., and three bedrooms, containing 2315 cubic feet. Single-storey cottage.

	£	s.	d.
Excavator and concreter	36	4	4
Bricklayer	9	7	0
Tiler	13	17	9
Carpenter and joiner (including troughs for concrete)	42	19	8
Plasterer (including rough-cast)	25	5	8
Ironmonger (including ranges)	10	12	3
Plumber and glazier	5	12	0
Painter and decorator	4	12	0
	<hr/>		
	£148	10	8

In the second class it is unnecessary perhaps to occupy space with the details of cost of the first prize-winner, because this concrete cottage, though somewhat different in construction, was simply double the size of the cottage by the same builder which gained the third prize in class 1. The details of cost of the winners of the first and second prizes in class 2 are as follows:—

D Cottage: Pair. Whole site covered with concrete. Eleven-inch outside brick cavity walls, with mansard roof. Inside walls 4½-inch brick, with two coats of plaster. Roof, sides plain tiles; top, Symons' patent interlocking tiles. The cottages comprise each a living-room, scullery, larder, etc., and three bedrooms (one on ground floor), containing 2448 cubic feet.

	£	s.	d.
Excavator and concreter	7	1	0
Bricklayer	65	7	0
Tiler	19	3	0
Carpenter and joiner (including glazing)	85	16	0
Plasterer	16	16	0
Ranges and copper	5	16	3
Ironmonger	13	0	0
Plumber	5	10	0
Painter and decorator	15	11	6
	<hr/>		
	£234	0	9

E Cottage: Pair. Whole site covered with concrete. Nine-inch brick walls outside, 4½-inch inside. Two coats of plaster. Roof covered with plain tiles. The cottages comprise a large living-room, good scullery, larder, etc., and three bedrooms, containing 2981 cubic feet.

	£	s.	d.
Excavator and concreter	15	14	0
Bricklayer	94	15	0
Tiler	27	9	4
Carpenter and joiner	91	15	0
Plasterer	18	3	9
Ironmonger and smith (including ranges)	16	9	9
Plumber (including bath)	16	0	7
Painter and glazier	15	3	0
	<hr/>		
	£295	10	5

Since in many parts of the country all-wood cottages are common, the particulars of the cost of two of the dwellings which gained the first and second prizes in the wooden-cottages class are of value. The first prize-winning cottage was of the following dimensions :—

Living-room, with range, 16 ft. 3 in. by 11 ft. 9 in. Scullery, with copper, 11 ft. by 10 ft. Bedroom, ground floor, 9 ft. by 10 ft. 6 in.; bedrooms, attics, 12 ft. by 11 ft. 9 in., 12 ft. by 9 ft. Larder, etc. Bath which can be shut off the scullery. Walls framed of 4-in. by 2-in. timbers, braced and covered with insulating-paper and weather-boarding outside; lathed and plastered inside. Roof, pantiles. Foundations, 6 in. of cement concrete over whole area.

In regard to the cost of construction, we are able to give the figures—from the builder's contract—of a replica built in Hampshire and finished about the same time as the Exhibition cottage. It should be noted, however, that in this instance the prices include builder's profit. It is therefore a case of a 150% cottage, inclusive of builder's profit. The Hampshire cottage is also better in one way than the Letchworth one, for it is covered with steel lathing and rough-cast in place of weather-boarding, as at the Garden City.

	£	s.	d.
Excavator and concreter, 12s. 9d. per yard cube	4	19	3
4000 bricks and mortar	9	0	0
Bricklayers and labourers and tiling, wages 8½d. and 6d.	7	15	0
Roofing-tiles (Major's interlocking), ridge tiles, and chimney-pots	13	0	0
Timber and carpenter's materials complete	32	0	0
Labour in ditto, ditto, wages 8d.	18	4	0
Plasterer, outside work (materials and labour), 2s. 7d. per yard super	12	18	0
Plaster inside, 1s. 3d. per yard super	15	13	0

THE CHEAP COTTAGE

	£	s.	d.
Smith (including bath, etc.) and plumber's materials	20	4	3
Plumber (labour only), wages 8½d.	2	1	0
Painter (materials)	3	18	0
„ (labour), wages 7½d.	4	10	0
52 feet drains and catchpit (materials and labour)	4	10	6
	<hr/>		
	£148	13	0

The particulars in regard to the second prize-winner are as follows:—

Timber Cottage: Whole site covered with concrete. Brick foundations. Framing 4 inches by 4 inches, covered outside with weather-board, lined with felt; inside with lath and plaster. Roof covered with pantiles. The cottage comprises a large living-room, scullery, bath-room, larder, etc., and three bedrooms, containing 2101 cubic feet.

	£	s.	d.
Excavator and concreter	4	10	0
Bricklayer	27	10	0
Tiler	12	15	0
Carpenter	53	10	0
Joiner	15	10	0
Plasterer	11	15	0
Smith and ironmonger (including range and bath)	15	0	0
Plumber and glazier	3	12	6
Painter and decorator	3	10	0
	<hr/>		
	£147	12	6

There were, of course, other classes of cottages than the 150l. class, the 300l.-a-pair class, and the 150l. of wood. A prize of 100l. was won by Mr A. Randall Wells for the best cottage at not more than 35l. a room. But a surprise of the Exhibition was undoubtedly the cottage erected by a well-known Hampshire and Sussex landowner, Mr A. H. Clough, a son of the poet, who has long shown a practical interest in inexpensive cottage-building, and desired to demonstrate what was practicable at a low expenditure. His cottage, which a speaker at the Royal Sanitary Institute might well say deserved its prize of 100l. as the 'cheapest cottage in the Exhibition,' may be described as follows:—

Brick cottage with semi-mansard roof. The site is covered with concrete. The walls are 11-inch brick-cavity to first floor; the remainder 4-inch by 2-inch framing and rafters, covered with plain tiles and patent interlocking tile. Inside, two coats of plaster. The cottage comprises living-room,

scullery, larder, etc., and three bedrooms (one on the ground floor), containing 2561 cubic feet.*

Excavator and concreter	£	s.	d.
Bricklayer	4	2	6
Tiler	33	12	0
Carpenter and joiner and glazier	10	6	0
Plasterer	48	2	0
Ranges and copper	8	3	0
Ironmonger	4	2	9
Plumber	4	17	0
Painter and decorator	2	15	0
	4	15	6

£120 15 9

In order to make the foregoing prices as useful as possible to the reader, it is necessary to add this statement of the cost of materials and labour on the site—

Bricks (common) per 1000	£	s.	d.
Sand, per yard	1	1	0†
Gravel (unsifted), per yard	0	2	9
Cement, per ton	0	2	9
Lime, per quarter	1	9	0
Tiles, per 1000	0	4	6
Inch floor boards, per square	1	10	0
Fir floor joists and roof, per foot cube	0	12	0
	0	1	4

Labour.—Bricklayers, carpenters, plumbers, and plasterers, 8d. to 9d.; painters and glaziers, 7d.; labourers, 5d. to 6d. per hour. Horse, cart, and man, about 8s. per day.

If all these figures may be trusted—and they come before us with every appearance of authority—it is absurd to suggest that the problem of the cheap cottage has not been practically solved for large rural areas in this country so far as the cost of building goes. We say for large rural areas, because the conditions at Letchworth are admittedly not applicable everywhere. The price of bricks, for instance, was low; and gravel and grit for concrete lay close at hand. But all the advantages were not on the side of the Exhibition builders. They were in many instances working outside their own districts and employing strange hands. They were also working against time. It is the fact, we believe, that several

* Full measurements of all the rooms in the cottages, a few particulars only of which could be set out in this article, are furnished in 'The Book of the Cheap Cottages Exhibition.'

† A certain proportion of better bricks, costing up to 1l. 5s. per 1000, was used.

builders found themselves involved in additional expenditure through these causes. Drawbacks of this particular sort should hardly have to be taken into account in estate work. In estate work it is also possible to standardise, to buy materials in large quantities, and to build more than one cottage at a time. We have been speaking, of course, of single cottages or cottages built in pairs. If we put the saving of building in pairs at a ten-pound note—and it should be quite that—the economy of building four cottages adjoining should be considerable. And in most agricultural districts there is every advantage in building in fours, if not in eights. No less an authority than the architect of Messrs Cadbury's model village at Bournville has published a plan of an attractively designed group of eight five-roomed cottages for which careful estimates, based on a large experience, have been made. The accommodation and the working out of the cost is as follows:—

Living-room, 12 ft. 4 in. by 13 ft. Kitchen, 8 ft. by 12 ft. 6 in. (with "Cabinet" bath, and boilers with patent steam exhaust). Larder under stairs. First bedroom, 9 ft. 2 in. by 13 ft., and recess. Second bedroom, 8 ft. 4 in. by 11 ft. 2 in. Third bedroom, 7 ft. 6 in. by 8 ft. Total cost, 135*l.* per cottage. Laying-out of garden, 7*l.* 10*s.* extra. Cubical contents, 64,800 ft. at 4*d.* per foot cube = 1080*l.* per block, or 135*l.* per cottage.

In the 135*l.* is included 3½ per cent. as the builder's profit of the Village Trust. Four cottages on the same plan at Bournville cost 160*l.* a cottage, again including the 3½ per cent.; but these dwellings were erected on made ground and were provided with the more expensive sunk bath. It is obvious that, in regard to these items and the brick wall to shut off the scullery—matchboard would do—economies might be made. Labour may also be dearer at Bournville than in many rural districts.

Again, we read in the 'Journal of the Society of Estate Clerks of the Works,' that sixteen brick cottages, built by the Southwold Corporation and 'opened' by the chairman of the National Housing Reform Council,* have been erected at a cost of 2395*l.*, or less than 150*l.* a cottage. The dwellings contain 'a living-room, kitchen,

* This organisation is arranging Cheap Cottage Exhibitions at Newcastle and Sheffield for next year.

three bedrooms, several useful cupboards, and excellent sanitary fittings and drainage, with four or five perches of garden behind.'

Mr Clough, whose Exhibition cottages have already been referred to, has undoubtedly erected many five-roomed cottages on his properties within the 150*l.*, and he is convinced that the same thing is being done by other people. Mr Pretymann, late Secretary of the Admiralty, who has built and rebuilt not far short of three hundred cottages in ten years in Suffolk, has lately erected a pair of three-storey cottages of timber and plaster on expanded metal estimated to come within 300*l.*, with this remarkable accommodation:—

Living-room, 13 ft. by 12½ ft. Scullery, larder, coal-store, and general shed or bakehouse and washhouse. Bedroom 13 ft. by 9½ ft. Bedroom 13 ft. by 8 ft. Attic bedroom 13 ft. by 11 ft. Large store closet.

The estimate was as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
Bricklayer	70	0	0
Joiner	88	0	0
Bricks	15	0	0
Timber, per contract	48	0	0
Tiles and ridge	6	10	0
Metal lathing	10	0	0
Stoves and ranges	7	8	0
Steel joists and brackets	9	0	0
To cover lime, floor-boards, nails, paint, glass, lead, materials for doors and windows, etc.	50	0	0
	<hr/>		
	£303	18	0

Sir Walter Gilbey is another landowner who offers proof that he can put up a pair of cottages for 300*l.* They are built in the old Essex manner of 'clay lumps,' weather-boarded, and look well, and seem extremely comfortable. They give the following accommodation:—

Living-room, 14½ ft. by 10½ ft. Kitchen 11½ ft. by 8 ft. Bedroom 11 ft. by 8½ ft. Bedroom 11½ ft. by 8 ft. Bedroom 8 ft. by 8 ft. A commodious washhouse and coal place are provided.

Mr J. Hayman-Joyce erected in Sussex last year a block of four cottages of six, not five, rooms at a total cost of 447*l.*, or say 112*l.* each, which, he says, 'includes architect's fees and builder's profit, but does not include

any charge for land nor for fencing the gardens.' The site, let it be noted, is seven miles from a station. The dimensions of the rooms are as follows:—

Living-room $9\frac{1}{2}$ ft. by 9 ft. Parlour 12 ft. by 9 ft. Wash-house $8\frac{1}{2}$ ft. by 6 ft. Bedroom $12\frac{1}{2}$ ft. by $9\frac{1}{2}$ ft. Bedroom $9\frac{1}{2}$ ft. by $9\frac{1}{2}$ ft. Bedroom $9\frac{1}{2}$ ft. by 6 ft.

Like Mr Clough, Mr Hayman-Joyce bought all the materials himself and paid prompt cash, thereby securing the best terms. He adds, in a letter to the 'Field':

'A builder contracted for the labour, and he has been allowed a recognised profit. All timber, joinery, fittings, and ironmongery came from London, and had to bear heavy cartage as well as railway freight. Lime and cement have had to bear a forty-mile railway charge and seven-mile cartage charge. Bricks have been delivered on the site at 28s. per thousand, and tiles at 35s. per thousand. Sand has been dug on the property (the only local product employed) and delivered, screened, on the site at 5s. 6d. per yard. It will be seen from the above that I have not been favoured by any exceptional advantages—rather the reverse.

'The external walls are of 9-in. brickwork, built hollow and faced with cement up to the first floor. The upper storey is covered with weather-boarding previously creosoted under pressure, and afterwards covered with two coats of specially prepared paint; underneath the weather-boarding mastic felt is fixed to prevent draught. The internal walls are half brick; the chimney stacks, being carried up in the centre of the cottages, add warmth and stability to the building. The pitch of the rooms is 8 ft.; each room is lined with match-boarding to a height of 3 ft. 9 in., and plastered above, the match-boarding being used to reduce the cost of maintenance. The roof is covered with tiles. Each cottage is provided with a copper, sink, range, and detached e.c.; and two bedrooms in each cottage have fireplaces. The rain-water is collected and stored in large covered tanks.'

Again, the author of 'A Book of Cottages' states that he is himself erecting at Ellesmere Port six-roomed—not five-roomed—cottages in pairs and fours at about 160l. each. Writing of the pair of five-roomed cottages he put up at Garden City,* he says:

* 12,000 cubic feet in all at 5½d. Living-room, 14 ft. by 13 ft., and scullery. Upstairs three bedrooms, two with fireplaces. Materials: wood on 2 ft. of brick foundation, and 9 in. of concrete over site.

'I would undertake again to build such a pair under normal conditions for any landlord with 300*l.*; and, if the type were to be reduplicated, and several sets put up, further economies might be effected.'

Not far from Dublin, where, the 'Builders' Journal' states, 'building is dearer than in most provincial districts in England,' the public authority has completed eighty-six cottages at a cost varying from 145*l.* to 170*l.* according to distance from a railway-station.

'They are nearly all built of local granite rubble masonry walls, cement rendered, and then pebble-dashed in mortar outside. The inside walls and ceilings are plastered throughout. The roofs are covered with thick, heavy, rough Irish slates. The chimneys are of red-facing bricks. The accommodation consists of a kitchen 16 ft. by 12 ft., principal bedroom 12 ft. by 11 ft. 6 in., small scullery, pantry, and fuel store. Upstairs there are two attic bedrooms, 12 ft. by 16 ft. and 16 ft. by 11 ft. 6 in. respectively, the height to wall-plate being 4 ft. 9 in. In a few cases these houses have been built of concrete at a slightly less cost.'

Finally, the present Minister of Agriculture, who has had considerable experience as a cottage-builder, and takes pains to make his labourers' dwellings better and better, asserts roundly ('Times,' October 6, 1905) that 'the alleged impossibility of obtaining a good substantial labourer's cottage, with three bedrooms, living-room, kitchen, and scullery, for 150*l.* does not exist.'

Among the cottages to which reference has been made in the foregoing pages, there are dwellings of almost every material and combination of material except iron, patent slabs, and concrete blocks, the all-round economy of which in labourer's cottage-building needs to be more fully demonstrated before they can be expected to recommend themselves very widely. Some of the cheap cottages mentioned have been of brick or concrete, either monolithic or cement rough-cast, thrown on expanded metal supported on steel or wooden studding. Others have been constructed of wood, or of brick and wood, or of wood and tiles, or even of clay and straw and timber. It is not wholly, then, by the choice of one particular building material that the inexpensive cottage is obtained,

In point of fact, we find some of the builders of the cottages described using different materials in different districts. For instance, Mr Clough, who is building in two counties, recommends that his 120*l.* cottage should be built, not of brick up to the joists, but wholly of wood, covered with expanded metal and plaster, where the price of bricks is more than 25*s.* per 1000, as it almost always is in the south.

No doubt a brick cottage is on the whole preferable to a wooden one; but it is possible to overestimate the drawbacks to a wooden dwelling. As to the weather, wooden houses suffice in Holland, Scandinavia, and America, where the climatic conditions are certainly not less trying than with us. With regard to the risk of fire, the lowness of the insurance companies' premiums shows that the danger, if the dwellings are not built in too large groups, may be easily exaggerated.* As to the frequent need for repairs which is alleged, the patching is usually work which any village carpenter is equal to. It is possible, however, that as steel studding and expanded metal, which form a vermin-proof and fireproof substitute for deal and laths, become sufficiently known for rural builders not to be afraid of accepting contracts in which they are specified, wood may largely give place to plaster on expanded metal and steel studs as material for cottage-building.

As to the question of durability, it must be confessed that there are some attractive-looking cottages which are hardly likely to meet with the approval of trustees of estates. Mr Troup, an architect, has argued, however, that 'the necessity for new low-rented cottages in some districts is too great for any method for obtaining them to be overlooked.' Mr Clough, for example, has done a public service by relieving the overcrowding in his dis-

* The views of the companies in regard to the different materials for cottage-building may be gathered from the following letter addressed to us in reply to an enquiry, by the secretary of the Norwich Union office:—

'To turn now to the question of insurances, we would be willing, in the event of the buildings being specially constructed, to accept cottages built of clay or clay-lump and roofed with tile, slate, or iron, and to issue policies under our first-class tables at a rate of from 1*s.* 6*d.* per cent. Buildings built of lath, plaster, or studwork, corrugated or galvanised iron (with or without wood-framing or match-boarding), or wood with stud, lath, and plaster, and roofed with tile, slate, or metal, we would include under our second-class table at a rate of from 2*s.* 6*d.* per cent. For the buildings that are thatched, our rate would, under our third-class table, be 5*s.* per cent.'

tricts; and, whatever criticism with regard to permanence may be passed upon his cottages—which readers interested in the solution of the rural housing question would be well advised to see for themselves—one may believe, as Mr Troup has declared, that ‘the last word has not been said about these so-called temporary materials.’ Even in regard to such a familiar material as wood, application of the needed preservative is usually made in a haphazard way. As the ‘Field’ says,

‘One great disadvantage of sectional houses and bungalows erected of patent materials, galvanised sheets, slabs, and the like, is that, after they have been built, they are of very little value and cannot be sold for anything like their prime cost. The brick cottage with a tiled roof which has cost 200*l.* to erect, at the end of fifteen or twenty years is worth at least 150*l.*; and, if the garden has been well tended and fruit-trees have grown up, it might fetch even more money in open market. The iron bungalow, on the other hand, the sectional building, and others of that character, can hardly be expected to realise more than half their first cost; and, if there is occasion to mortgage a portion of an estate for the sake of raising a capital sum to improve the remainder, valuers look askance at buildings of the kind and put a low figure to the valuation.’

Some of the talk about the temporary character of cottages of steel studs and expanded metal and plaster is not according to knowledge. The truth seems to be that some critics of the use of these materials lack experience in handling them.

With monolithic concrete building it is, of course, less easy to associate the notion of impermanence. One of the drawbacks to its use is, indeed, that it is only too permanent for those who have to make alterations in the concrete structure. There must be areas, we should think, where the presence on the site of one of the many useful materials for concrete, combined with the low price of cement and the convenience of building a number of cottages in a row—and we have yet to learn that agricultural labourers are fond of isolated dwellings—must make the erection of monolithic structures worth consideration. Mr Aldwinckle, F.R.I.B.A., in a paper read before the Royal Sanitary Institute, said, however, that the advantage gained may not be very great.

'In those districts where good ballast can be obtained on the site, it is possible' (he said) 'that a 9-in. concrete wall would be slightly cheaper than a 9-in. brick wall, but it is very doubtful whether the small economy would outweigh the undeniable advantages of brickwork. We apparently come, then, to the conclusion that, all things considered, a brick wall is most suitable for cottages. The thickness must not be less than 9 inches; and an 11-in. hollow-brick wall is preferable. (The cheapest cottage at the Cottages Exhibition had this.) In any case the brickwork should be covered with rough-cast, as an additional protection against the weather. This external covering is even more necessary for a concrete wall.'

Even the author of the classic 'Potter on "Concrete"' is unwilling that too high expectations should be entertained in regard to concrete.

'There is nothing for rural cottages' (he wrote last autumn) 'better and cheaper than brickwork—at the present cost of bricks. Concrete walls are undoubtedly stronger, more durable, and dryer, if cemented externally, than brickwork; but unless made a special feature, with workmen adapted by practice and experience for the purpose, materials available at a low cost, and concrete construction is made a business—not confined to a cottage or two now and again—the result is not entirely what is expected.'

But, whatever savings may be made by the employment of materials which are the most economical in the particular district in which they are to be used, or by extreme simplicity of plan*—a consideration which is seldom sufficiently borne in mind by architects with a limited experience of cottage designing—or by the adoption of the bungalow type of cottage,† it must be plain to any one who looks clearly into the problem of the cheap cottage

* The architects of the cheap cottages near Dublin, to which reference has been made, say, 'Our experience leads us to feel that the way in which economy may best be effected is by extreme simplicity of plan.'

† Mr Thomas Potter, than whom there is no higher authority on estate cottage-building and concrete incottage work, writes, on page 27 of 'The Book of the Cheap Cottages Exhibition': 'On the three most important points of cost, healthfulness, and tenant's convenience, I am in hopes of having been able to show that a bungalow cottage possesses advantages that are impossible with a two-storey cottage. . . . Having built many cottages of both types, and having lived in a bungalow more than half an average lifetime, and in two-storey buildings, and higher still, the remainder, I may reasonably be allowed to speak with some authority.'

that there is another way in which the most important economies may be effected. Landowners like Mr Clough, Mr Pretymann, Sir Walter Gilbey, and Lord Carrington have obtained and are obtaining cheap cottages because they have thought the question of their economical construction important enough to claim their close personal attention. Cheap cottages cannot be expected by a building-owner who is not prepared himself to take trouble, and a great deal of trouble. It will be chiefly due to the exertions of landowners that the best types of cottages will be evolved. Though not a few architects and builders have taken a philanthropic interest in cottage-building, neither the architectural profession nor the building trade has the personal interest of the landowner in reducing the price of cottages to the lowest figure. Mr Clough, for example, to whom cottage-building is a hobby, buys his own materials in large quantities, has his cottage built by small builders trained by himself, and works on steadily from one improvement to another, so that his very latest cottages are usually the best and cheapest he has erected. On page 250 of the 'Builders' Journal' for Nov. 1, 1905, there is a list of the materials used in his 120*l.*—or to be accurate 120*l.* 16*s.* 8½*d.*—cottage,* in the minutest detail. He knows that nails cost 19*s.* 4½*d.* and glue 1½*d.*, and that the four chimney-pots were a shilling each.

'One of the greatest economies' (wrote Mr Clough in 'In Search of a 150*l.* Cottage') 'will be found in capable bargaining. Before entering the builder's shop, the buyer should be equipped with all possible statistics. He should be able to say: "Sir, I want 12,500 bricks, 800 Bridgwater tiles, a kitchen range at 35*s.*, 3 grates at 12*s.* 6*d.* each, 20 window-frames at 7*s.*, 40 window-lights at 3*s.* 6*d.*, 30*s.* worth of lead, 40*s.* worth of cement, so many doors, so many joists, etc. I have reason to know that, when a house of the plan I show you was built at town A, or village B, the whole of the carpentering was undertaken for 15*l.*, the whole of the bricklaying for 18*l.*, the whole of the painting for 3*l.*"

'What will the builder say in reply? Well, in every district I have to do with, builders, bricklayers, and car-

* 'In this perhaps, more than in any other cottage in the Exhibition,' wrote the 'Field,' 'do we approach the ideal cottage for the agricultural labourer.'

penters are much in want of work. The customer whom I describe is not the customer a builder would choose. But in my district I can produce half a dozen builders at least who would gladly accept. It is to be remembered that the small men, who work themselves, and work hard, will generally be relieved to know exactly what the quantities will be. It must necessarily be convenient to know accurately what you are selling.'

Referring to a group of three cottages of his in course of construction, the outside ones having six rooms each and the middle one four, Mr Clough says that 'the cost should be about 430%.' He adds:

'As it is unquestionable that, if any plan is handed to the average local builder, he will in many cases ask an exorbitant price, I may as well mention that a local builder in Sussex, when shown this plan, offered to carry it out for 650%. This fact may help to show that many builders have a very easy time.'

'An easy time' because those who employ them are content to go on paying prices framed on the rural builder's usual scale. This scale is not based, as it should be, on getting out of the workmen employed a full week's work for a full week's pay; nor is it drawn up, as it should be, to give the landowner the substantial advantage which is his right when he has no need to use the builder's capital, or rather the builder's merchant's capital, but is ready to pay cash.

It is possible that practical men may hesitate to accept as conclusive every one of the statements of cost which we have collected. It is admittedly difficult to check them; and every student of the cheap-cottage question knows of instances in which figures in regard to supposedly inexpensive dwellings have failed to stand investigation. As in the case of the balance-sheets of 'profitable poultry-farms,' some item or other of expenditure has been omitted; or it may be that for the new buildings old foundations, old tiles, or old outbuildings have been used without payment. The editor of the 'Journal of Estate Clerks of the Works' was good enough lately to bring to our notice three examples of this kind of thing. It will be admitted, however, that a sufficiently large body of evidence as to the possibility of

cheap cottages has been collected to justify landowners in making careful enquiries into the subject, and in believing that the building of homes for agricultural labourers is in many cases needlessly costly. Even the veteran clerk of the works we have quoted admits that 'cottages are being built, and have been built, on certain estates in certain counties—Wilts, Hants, Devonshire and Somerset principally—at an inclusive cost of 300*l.* per pair.'

'The best way I always found to build cottages' (he goes on to say) 'was to supply plans and specifications to the village carpenter and blacksmith, and either agree to pay them by measure at an agreed schedule of prices or, simpler still, to provide a complete bill of quantities and, with a view to inspire confidence, to agree to make the quantities the basis of the contract. If any work was done not contained in the bill, it became an extra. If anything was omitted, it was deducted. The bricklayer and carpenter were to price out their bill; and the total was to be the contract sum. If certain materials on the estate were to be used, these were to be delivered free, or the contractor was to pay fixed rates for same. Work done in this way enables small tradesmen to work as long as they like during long days, and practises them in "speeding up." I have in mind some of the best and cleverest men of years ago—only village carpenters and bricklayers—the principal source from which the bulk of London mechanics is derived and from which most of our largest contractors or their fathers hail. Of course no workmen at town wages can compete with work done in this way—so far as price is concerned.'

It is on lines not dissimilar from these that Mr Clough and Mr Pretzman have worked; and they have started in business not a few deserving rural craftsmen.

With regard to the difficult question of the return to be expected from inexpensive cottages, almost the last word has been said by the Minister of Agriculture.

'A landowner' (wrote Lord Carrington in the 'Times' of October 12, 1905) 'must not expect to get a direct high rate of interest on his outlay out of the actual rent paid by the labourer, as it is obvious that if the interest is taken at 3 per cent.—i.e. 4*l.* 10*s.* on a 150*l.* cottage—and the cottage is let to an agricultural labourer for 1*s.* per week—2*l.* 12*s.*—there is no margin for rates, insurance, and repairs. I have, however, no

doubt that, indirectly, a landowner who improves his estate by adding cottages to his farms, does eventually get a very high rate of interest for his outlay. . . . If a farmer has cottages on his farm, he knows that he can always secure labour; and my experience is that a higher rent can in consequence be obtained for a farm with cottages, even although the cottages be let at a nominal rent. 150*l.* cottages will not keep people on the land; but 150*l.* cottages, let at a rent of 1*s.* a week, will have that effect if the labourers have allotments or small holdings at a fair rent, as well as a garden.'

It cannot be doubted that an ample provision of cottages for labourers gives an important security to tenant farmers, security that in no case will labour be driven away by lack of housing; and that this security is of considerable financial value. At any rate the landowner who has provided an adequate number of cottages will not have demands made upon him for reductions in rent on the familiar ground that the labourers cannot get housed. Certainly the building owner who to estate timber-yards, brickfields, gravel-pits, etc., adds the advantage of building on his own land, must indirectly improve his property by erecting cottages, even if he lets them at a low rent which pays only rates and taxes.* But as a matter of fact he usually receives a little more than this.

When we come to the question of the building by-laws in rural districts, it is unnecessary to write with the severity that was justifiable enough a short time ago. The struggle with stupid and prejudiced Councils and ignorant and obstinate surveyors continues in some districts. Drastic bylaws, reasonable enough in Camberwell, are enforced or not enforced in areas 'miles from anywhere,' according to the friendly or unfriendly relations which exist between the landowner and the majority of the Council, or between his clerk of the works and the surveyor—who may be an ex-publican. A well-to-do popular or tactful building owner is left free to build while his less highly estimated neighbour is hampered in doing so. The administration of the bylaws may,

* The burden of rates and taxes—and there is no sign of their becoming less heavy—is undoubtedly, in some cases, one of the motives which hinder the low renting of existing cottages and the building of new ones.

however, be arbitrary without being unjust to individuals. We are ourselves familiar with cases in several counties in which the regulations, enforced with a high hand, were absurd from all points of view, whether of health, sound building, or sightliness.

But the agitation in the Press and Parliament against bylaws which, drawn up with the best intentions, have resulted in some cases in preventing economical building altogether, has had its effect. The Local Government Board, which took a distinct step forward in issuing its Rural Model Bylaws of 1904, has since accepted the advice frequently pressed upon it, and has gently explained in a circular to the Councils of the country that regulations necessary enough in the metropolis may be safely relaxed in many rural areas. As a result, several Councils have proposed, we believe, to amend their bylaws. We could wish the number were greater. It may yet become desirable that the Board, which was undoubtedly largely responsible in the first instance for the unnecessarily strict rural building bylaws that were so widely enacted, should issue a second circular, or an adaptation of its Rural Model and Urban Model Bylaws, so as to form an Intermediate Series. Nevertheless, the number of complaints of cases of hardship suffered at the hands of Councils is diminished. Some of these authorities have ceased latterly to enforce their more stringent bylaws, albeit by such a course of action they place themselves at the mercy of any busybody.

The success which has been attained by Lord Hylton's Public Health Acts (Building Bylaws) Bill, which has passed the Standing Committee of the House of Lords, and by Mr Mackarness's Housing of the Working Classes Amendment Bill, now in Committee of the House of Commons, is another pleasant sign of the change which has been wrought in public opinion. But perhaps the most promising indication of all to rural residents who wish to see the question of building bylaws in country districts put on a common-sense basis is to be found in the presence of Lord Carrington and Mr John Burns at the Board of Agriculture and Local Government Board. The Board of Agriculture has many opportunities of playing a part in helping to solve the rural housing problem; and it is unlikely that so keen a cottage-builder as Lord

Carrington will be disposed to neglect them. Mr Burns, in his turn, has a sincere interest in the question of the provision of sanitary dwellings for the working-classes. Those who fear that a slackening of the restrictions on rural building will open the door to the jerry-builder may take comfort from the fourth clause of the Local Government Board's circular to the Councils as to the 'strict observation of sanitary requirements,' wherein we seem to see the President's own hand. Reasonable liberty in rural building must be secured, but the liberty must not be permitted to degenerate into license. One or two trumpery erections at the Cottages Exhibition are an illustration of the kind of thing the building of which must be prevented.

Whether the Bills of Lord Hylton and Mr Mackarness are pushed forward or are embodied in the Government Bill which Mr Burns has evidently in his mind, does not much matter. But it would be greatly to be regretted if the promise of an official Bill should be the means of shelving the Bills already so far advanced, without ensuring the introduction and pushing forward of a substitute. However good the intentions with which a Local Government Board Bill might be brought into the House of Commons, circumstances might conceivably prevent it making rapid progress next year.

'HOME COUNTIES.'

Art. IX.—THE BRITISH MUSEUM (NATURAL HISTORY).

Statutes and Rules of the British Museum, made by the Trustees in pursuance of the Act of Incorporation (26 George II, cap. 22, s. xv).

HE who, after visiting the imposing building in Cromwell Road, often called the Natural History Museum, but more correctly the British Museum (Natural History), and after examining the magnificent collection of specimens of 'the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms' housed and exhibited therein, takes the trouble to enquire into the history of the Museum, will come across a striking instance of evolution, and of that particular kind of evolution, so common in human affairs, in which much of what exists to-day exists because it was needed in days gone by, and not because it is needed now or best fulfils the purposes which it is made to serve.

The British Museum may, in a certain sense, be said to have come into existence in the reign of William III, an Act of Parliament (12 and 13 Will. III, cap. vii) placing the Cottonian Library at Westminster under the care of Trustees, among whom were the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Chancellor, and the Speaker of the House of Commons. It was not fully born, however, until 1753, when it was definitely established by an Act of Parliament (26 Geo. II, cap. xxii),

'for the purchase of the Museum or Collection of Sir Hans Sloane and of the Harleian Collections of Manuscripts; and for providing one General Repository for the better reception and more convenient use of the said collections, and of the Cottonian Library and of the additions thereto.'

The general repository thus established was placed in charge of a body of Trustees, consisting partly of Trustees by virtue of office, among whom three—the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Chancellor, and the Speaker of the House of Commons—were designated 'Principal Trustees,' partly of Trustees by family appointment, representing the families of the chief donors, the Cotton, the Sloane, and the Harley families, and partly of elected Trustees. In subsequent years large additions to the Museum were made from time to time. These

were of various kinds; but, owing to the numerous gifts of books, notably those given by George IV, the Library continued to be, as it was from the beginning, a dominant part of the establishment.

The government by the Trustees has been continued; and, though some changes or additions have from time to time been made, the body of Trustees remains at the present day, and their powers remain on the whole, the same as at the foundation. At the present day the Trustees are 49 in number—24 by office, 1 by the appointment of the Crown, 9 by family appointment, and 15 co-opted by the Trustees themselves. Of the 24 by office, three are the 'Principal Trustees' mentioned above, the remaining 21 consisting of Cabinet Ministers, high legal officers, the Bishop of London, and the Presidents of the Royal Society, the College of Physicians, the Society of Antiquaries, and the Royal Academy. So large a body is unfitted to transact the ordinary business of the Museum; and this is therefore entrusted to a 'standing committee' consisting of the three Principal Trustees and of 15 other Trustees appointed annually, the committee reporting their proceedings to general meetings of all the Trustees held quarterly. Though great powers are vested in this standing committee, the power of appointing the officers of the Museum rests with the three Principal Trustees alone.

The first officers of importance, namely, the 'Principal Librarian,' three 'keepers of departments' (Manuscript department, Natural History department, and Library of Printed Books), and three 'assistant librarians' belonging respectively to the above three departments, were appointed in 1756. In 1787 a new office, that of 'secretary,' was established; but in 1849 the duties of this office were united with those of Principal Librarian. In the course of time other new offices were established; of these it is unnecessary to speak here, except in one case.

Though the Library was from early times so far the dominant part of the whole establishment that the Principal Librarian was the chief officer, all other officers being 'subordinate' officers, whose duty it was 'to assist the Principal Librarian in the care and custody of the Museum,' the Natural History collections soon became too large to be satisfactorily handled by the Principal

Librarian, whose abilities were literary, not scientific. In consequence, a new office, that of 'Superintendent of the departments of Natural History,' was established in 1856. The Superintendent, though a high, was still a 'subordinate' officer. He transmitted the reports of the keepers of the departments of Natural History, with his remarks on them, not directly to the standing committee, but to the Principal Librarian; and, while having to take care that the officers, attendants, and servants of these departments did their duty, he had no power over them himself, and reported their omissions, not to the standing committee, but to the Principal Librarian.

Early in the last century it became evident that the buildings in Bloomsbury were wholly unfitted for the housing of the rapidly increasing Natural History collections. Various appeals were made to the Government; and finally it was decided to place these in a separate building, constructed for the purpose, in Cromwell Road, South Kensington. The removal took place in 1880-1884.

In the statutes of 1886, drawn up after the removal, certain changes are to be found. In the older statutes the whole establishment was spoken of as 'the Museum'; in 1886 the words 'the Museum (Bloomsbury)' and 'the Museum (Natural History)' are used, though occasionally 'the Museum' appears to be used in the old sense. The quarterly general meetings of the whole body of Trustees are directed to be held alternately at the one Museum and at the other. The standing committee are instructed to meet at the one Museum or the other, and to 'report their proceedings to general meetings held at that branch of the Museum to which they refer.' The officer previously styled 'Superintendent of the departments of Natural History,' is now called 'the Director of the Museum (Natural History),' or simply the Director, his duties being defined in the same chapter of the statutes as those of the Principal Librarian under the title 'Rules relative to the Principal Librarian and Director.' He is no longer a subordinate officer; and he is by the statutes directed to perform at the Museum (Natural History) specified duties 'similar to those discharged by the Principal Librarian at the Museum (Bloomsbury).'

The foregoing sketch, brief as it is, will suffice to show that, great as have been the expansion and development

of the whole Museum, the part devoted to Natural History has increased out of proportion to the rest. It is true that, in a recent issue of the statutes (1898), certain changes are to be found indicating, to some extent, a reduction in the importance of the Natural History Museum relative to that in Bloomsbury; but we need not dwell on these. We have before us the fact that what was originally a part of a 'general repository,' indeed an appendage to a library, and hence managed by a librarian, has become a great national collection of natural history, second perhaps to none in the world.

Not every one who passes by, not every one even who visits this great Natural History Museum in Cromwell Road, understands what is its real nature and purpose; and we desire here to say something about this. In doing so, though it is a museum belonging to the so-called 'three kingdoms of nature,' animal, vegetable, and mineral, we will, for simplicity's sake, in what we are about to say, consider it as being, what indeed by far the greater part of it is, a museum belonging to the animal kingdom, a zoological museum. We feel all the more justified in doing this by the fact that the zoological collection, in certain respects, stands quite apart from the other two. The botanical collection has its fellow in the collection at the Royal Gardens at Richmond (Kew); the two have so much in common that a few years ago an enquiry carried out by a departmental committee recommended that the botanical collection should be removed from Cromwell Road to Richmond and amalgamated with the collection there, both the national botanical collections being placed under one administration. Similarly the mineralogical and geological collections have relations with those of the Geological Survey and the School of Mines, also national institutions. The zoological collection stands alone as the single national collection; the only other large collection in London, the Hunterian Museum, being the private property of the College of Surgeons. We do not now propose to deal with the questions thus raised, important as they are; we simply refer to the facts in support of our proposal to deal with the zoological collection alone.

Such a museum is a collection of authentic specimens of animals of all kinds, gathered, as befits a great national

establishment, from all parts of the world. All these specimens are, or should be, authoritatively identified and named, classified and arranged, either in the way of exhibition or otherwise, according to the use to be made of them, and catalogued in such a manner that their existence and position in the Museum can be readily ascertained, and reference made, when necessary, to the individual histories of each. The uses to which such a collection can and ought to be put are manifold. One highly important scientific use is that the specimens serve as standards of reference. If, for instance, it be desired to know whether an animal found here or there is a known animal, and, if so, what is its scientific name, its specific name (and this reveals at once its position in the animal kingdom), this can be ascertained by comparing it with the specimens in the Museum, supposing that the collection is a complete one. And it may here be incidentally remarked that the value of the collection obviously depends on the collection being as complete as possible.

This use of the Museum as a means of identifying specimens, important as in certain cases it may be, is one only, and by no means the greatest, of its uses. The authentic specimens in the Museum serve, so to speak, as counters in the games which we call biological problems; and these are both many and of the most varied character and importance. To attempt to describe them would be to attempt a treatise on biology. It will be enough here to take a single instance and to recall to mind the importance which, especially since Darwin's great work, attaches to the facts of variation in animals; by the study of these facts we are making steady progress in our knowledge of the nature of heredity, and gaining an insight into some of the most profound mysteries of life. Now, if the Museum contains, as it ought to do, not one specimen only of a particular animal form found in one particular place, but many specimens gathered from as many different places as possible, and specimens showing differences, even slight and abstruse differences, from the specimen which serves as the historic type of the form—if the Museum contains these specimens duly arranged, as they ought to be, for ready reference, it becomes a storehouse of facts of variation the value of which, from the point of view of general biological

science, cannot easily be exaggerated. But the facts of variation are only some of the facts which the Museum teaches. It is a storehouse of biological facts of the most diverse kinds; it is a collection not only of dead animals, dried, stuffed, bottled up or pinned down, but also of living biological truths, silent as the dead forms so long as no one asks the proper question, speaking with clear, far-reaching voices so soon as the right man puts the fitting query.

It would be a waste of time to dwell further on the great and manifold uses of the Museum as a means of scientific research. But it has other uses as well. The Museum belongs to the people; it is supported by the people's money; and it is only right that some benefit to the people more direct than that yielded by abstract science should come from it. And great direct benefit can, with some little administrative care, be got from it for the people. In this dull life of ours, above all in this dull city of ours, with its murky surroundings, it is no small thing that an easy stroll, without fee, should bring the dweller in slum alley and unlovely street face to face with the countless beauties of the animal creation; and much of the animal world is beautiful even in death. It is perhaps even a greater thing that, as is clearly shown by what has been done during the past few years, the collections may be so arranged and displayed as to bring to even the careless stroller lessons not only of beauty but also of wisdom, opening his eyes to some of the great truths of the world of life.

We may now ask the question, What are the duties involved in so carrying on this great Museum as to ensure that it shall serve efficiently, first as a great means of scientific research (and, we may add, of scientific teaching), and secondly, as a great opportunity for educating and elevating the general public?

One great duty is obviously the most careful preservation of the specimens already present in the collection, and their housing and arrangement in such a way that they shall be available for scientific research. To this may be added the exhibition of such specimens as may be suitable for the purpose, with the view of interesting and, if possible, instructing the general public. On this duty there is no need to dwell, were it not that the task of

properly arranging the specimens involves another task of great intricacy and importance—the identification, naming, and classification of the specimens; and on this some few words must be said.

When it is remembered how many hundreds of fresh specimens arrive each year, and must do so if the Museum is to continue to be one of the foremost museums of the world, this task will be seen to be no small one. It is also one of great difficulty. At first sight it might appear that the best solution would be to attach to the Museum a staff of trained experts whose chief if not only duty should be to deal with the specimens as they arrive. But the satisfactory determination of a species demands so large an amount of exact and special knowledge as to have led to an enormous subdivision of labour among systematic zoologists. It is a common saying that it needs a lifetime to acquire that thorough knowledge of even a tiny group of animals which alone will furnish a sound judgment on the specific differences of the individuals forming the group and on their relations to each other. Hence a staff fully qualified to judge of all specimens must be a very large one; and, if the members of the staff are to be paid in such a way as to secure the best work, this must entail an enormous expenditure.

On the other hand, there are to be found, if not in this country alone, at least in it and other countries, men who, through love of science, have been led to devote sometimes their whole lives, sometimes their whole leisure, only to acquiring just that complete knowledge of small groups of animals which makes each of them the best living expert for the identification of specimens belonging to some small group. Many such men are ready to offer their services for such tasks; and in many cases the opportunity thus afforded of enlarging their special knowledge would be considered by them an adequate remuneration for their labours. There can be little doubt but that such an identification of specimens by outside experts of acknowledged reputation is—at least in very many cases—the best, the most effective, the most secure, and, it may be added, infinitely the cheapest plan.

The duties of the Museum, however, do not end with the identification of specimens. If it is to maintain

its high reputation and its great usefulness, it must continually add to its collections, striving to make all these as complete as possible. It must do all in its power to induce the owners of private collections to give or to bequeath them to the nation; this it will readily be understood is a test of administrative tact. It must be prepared to purchase at their proper, but not at any factitious value, collections which may be offered for sale. And there is a method of adding to the collection, one of peculiar value, of which the great museum at New York has made use with the happiest results, namely, the sending-out of expeditions to secure particular objects from particular places. The scientific value of specimens so obtained far exceeds, in nearly all cases, that of any already made collection purchased more or less at hazard or incidentally presented.

The several duties just mentioned are more or less of a routine kind; the performance of them calls for a certain amount of knowledge and of judgment but for little else, and can be adequately secured by appropriate administrative rules. But beyond these routine duties there are others of a higher and more difficult kind. As was said above, the great value of such a museum, the one thing which above all others justifies a large expenditure of public money upon it, lies in the collections being made use of in the solution of important, pressing, general biological problems. The mechanisms of the Museum may be perfect, or as nearly perfect as possible, in respect to the acquirement, identification, arrangement, and preservation of the specimens; the collections may be the most complete possible; they may be most admirably housed and exhibited; but the Museum may be a lifeless museum, an intricate organism doing nothing, beautiful to look at in its quiescence, but a sleeping beauty and nothing more. It needs to be made alive, and to be kept alive, by the spirit of enquiry being breathed into all its parts. Only through research making itself felt in every room, in every case, in every drawer, can the great collection fulfil its chief and highest duty. It can only justify its existence and the money spent on it by making itself felt as a potent factor in the national intellectual life.

In two ways can research be fostered in the Museum. In the first place, free hospitality can be offered to investi-

gators having otherwise no connexion with the establishment. The Museum could do much by not only permitting, but even inviting and encouraging scientific workers to make use, for the purpose of enquiry, of its great resources. Certain conditions would of course have to be imposed on the use of the Museum by such outside enquirers; but, if the regulations were guided by the principle that, in making arrangements for it, the Museum was fulfilling one of its chief duties, and that not only science, but the Museum itself benefited by the use being extended, administrative difficulties would soon be overcome.

In the second place, research would be fostered, and possibly even to a greater extent, were it laid down as part of the constitution of the Museum that the members, or at least the chief members of the staff, should be men not merely capable of performing more or less routine duties, but distinguished for their powers of research. If the view just urged be accepted, namely, that the chief duty of the Museum is to serve not merely as a collection beautiful to look at, but as a direct and much-needed means of scientific enquiry, then this demand as to the character of the staff must inevitably follow.

This indeed brings us at once to a consideration of the nature of the staff needed in order that the Museum may rightly fulfil the duties just discussed. We may now put to ourselves the question—Suppose the Museum, with its present unrivalled collections, were suddenly created as a new institution, what kind of staff would be needed to enable the various duties on which we have dwelt to be efficiently carried out? The whole collection (we are, as we said at the beginning, dealing, for simplicity's sake, with the zoological collections in the first instance only) would naturally be divided into sections corresponding to the divisions of the animal kingdom accepted by zoologists; there would be departments of mammals, of birds, of fishes, of insects, and the like. Owing to the great and increasing specialisation of knowledge, it would be necessary to place each of the several departments under the charge of a special officer, who would be primarily responsible for the care of everything belonging to that department.

The nature of the work of each department, and the

nature of the departmental staff needed to carry it out, will of course depend on the policy adopted in respect to the identification and naming of specimens. The arguments in favour of the plan spoken of above, of making use of all available outside talent, rather than of keeping up an expert staff for this purpose, seem to us so overwhelming that we venture to take it for granted that it would be adopted. This being so, one main duty of the keeper or officer in charge of a department would be to make himself fully acquainted with all existing outside talent, and with the means by which it might be utilised; he would have to keep himself in constant touch with what was being done in this and other countries in the branch of science under his care. This would entail considerable effort on his part, but it would go far in building up his scientific character and position; he would have wider views than if he were simply the head of a small expert staff, shut off from the rest of the world.

The adoption of the plan in question, while very largely increasing the duties and especially the responsibilities of the keeper, would bring about a very great reduction in the number, and a great change in the nature of the duties, of the staff under him. These duties would become largely mechanical; and the members of the staff would hold very subordinate positions. They would be for the most part ordinary trained museum attendants or caretakers, carrying out definite instructions with respect to the arrangement, display, and preservation of the specimens; some would be workmen skilled in the art of 'putting up' and of displaying specimens. 'What further assistance the keeper would need, beyond that of a clerical kind, in carrying out his own duties, in providing for the identification of new specimens, in intercalating these into the collections, and in arranging and displaying the collections so that they might possess the greatest possible scientific value—whether, for instance, he would need scientific help in the way of an assistant-keeper, or the like, may be left for the present out of consideration. Whether he had such assistance or not, the keeper must be a man combining scientific eminence in his own line with administrative ability. His duties would not be arduous in the sense of consuming a large amount of time, but they would be arduous in the sense of entailing

a large amount of responsibility. For to ensure that no opportunities of adding to the collections are lost, and that the other duties mentioned above are efficiently performed, means responsibility of no slight kind. What may we lay down as the essential qualifications of such a keeper?

In order to ensure completeness and exactitude in his collections it is not necessary that he should be a systematist, that is to say, one whose scientific activity is directed towards determining the likenesses and unlikenesses of animals with the view of classifying them into cognate groups. But it is absolutely necessary that he should have deep sympathy with 'collections,' a sympathy bordering on devotion; he must fully recognise the immense scientific value of collections, realising to the utmost the importance of having in hand the full number of counters, each of absolute accuracy, when the games of scientific problems are being played. He may be a systematist; he may have a passion for determining counters; but he must be something more. He must be in hearty sympathy with biological enquiry, and ever ready to assist endeavours to use the counters for the solution of biological problems.

He should have what we may call the spirit of a teacher. We do not mean that he should have the gift for elementary teaching, for that mechanical sort of teaching the goal of which is to secure academic degrees. But he should have the power of leading other and younger men along the path of scientific enquiry; he should be a teacher of research. To exercise that power he must have opportunities; and the best opportunities would be afforded by his being able to instruct in his own line of study those who, by their previous work, have shown themselves capable of going further. He should indeed be encouraged so to use his position as, by higher teaching, first to induct the fitted into original investigations, and then to direct them towards success. And such teaching would be good for himself; it would give life to his mere routine duties; it would keep him constantly in touch with the younger generation, and prevent that benumbing isolation which has such an evil effect on the man of science in an official position screening him from the criticisms, but at the same time depriving him of the help, of the

outside world. For such teaching his more routine duties ought to leave him ample time; and indeed the possession of the power to teach in this way ought to be a recommendation for the post. It may at times happen that one otherwise highly qualified for the post of keeper possesses also to a marked degree the gift of popular exposition. Seeing that the Museum belongs not to science only, and exists not for science only, but belongs to, and exists for the people, such a gift should not, by any fanciful restrictions, be hidden under the bushel of office. Greater care is undoubtedly needed in the provision for popular exposition than in that for advanced studies; opportunities are perhaps more likely to be abused or wasted in the former case; but any such abuses could easily be avoided by adequate care.

Supposing then that the scientific staff of the Museum, as distinguished from the mechanical staff of attendants, workmen, and clerks, consists mainly of keepers, or heads of departments, not necessarily all equal, with such additional scientific aid, in the shape of assistant-keepers or the like, as may be found necessary or profitable, it is obvious that these keepers must not occupy wholly independent positions, subject only to some governing body. Each department cannot be allowed to go on its own way, and manage its own business quite irrespective of what the other departments are doing. They must be co-ordinated; and the only satisfactory mechanism of co-ordination is that of the headship of one person. No group of persons, even though some, nay, even though all of them be persons possessing adequate scientific knowledge, can effect the needed co-ordination by meeting together at intervals. What is needed is the continual presence of some one person of such scientific eminence as to command respect, of such wide scientific knowledge as to be able to appreciate the wants of all the departments, and of such administrative skill and tact as will enable him to reconcile conflicting interests.

Some sort of governing body, however, will be necessary; a wholly free hand cannot be given to the Director or to the combined staffs. The governing body should be small enough to be effective in action and yet large enough to represent the several interests concerned. Those interests, however, are, in the main, two only—the

interests of biological science and the interests of the nation, the latter demanding that public money should not be wastefully spent. The State and science should join to form the governing body.

The State, as such, must have a large share in the governing body, for the Museum is sustained by public funds. Indeed, in view of the large sums which it receives from the national purse, the Museum ought in justice to be looked upon as a Government department. But, quite apart from the fact that, though sustained by public funds, it has come into existence largely through private endowments, its scientific character makes it necessary that its administration should not be that of an ordinary Government department. Where scientific work is being carried on, one of two methods of administration may be adopted, the choice being determined by circumstances. Where the scientific work is mainly of a routine kind—work in which scientific knowledge is used to secure definite ends, scientific enquiry intervening in an incidental manner only—the kind of administration needed is that which long experience has shown to be the most effective, namely, that known as the Civil Service system. Where the scientific work is mainly that of enquiry—work having for its aim the progress of science, routine scientific work coming in incidentally only—long experience has similarly shown that the best kind of administration is that which obtains in learned bodies, universities, and the like, and which may be called the academic method. Now, unless what has gone before has been written wholly in vain, the work of the Natural History Museum is essentially work of a purely scientific kind, work of scientific enquiry. In every feature it contrasts most strongly with the scientific work carried out by a Government department, say by the Local Government Board, or the Board of Trade, work in which scientific enquiry comes in incidentally only, and has to be provided for in a special way. We are thus brought to the conclusion that the Museum ought to be administered, not on the lines of the Civil Service system, but according to the academic method.

The State has on its hands other establishments resembling the Natural History Museum in that they are collections valuable as a means of advancing human knowledge,

but unlike it in that they deal, not with natural science, but with other branches of human knowledge. The question naturally arises, Is it desirable to place all these establishments under the same governing body?

In favour of doing so, it may be urged that such a plan would relieve the Government or Parliament from the responsibility of deciding how much of the total sum of public money granted to all the establishments should be given to each. But a wise Government or Parliament would not wish for such relief; it would desire to determine for itself, in a broad way, how the money should be spent. It may further be urged that the several branches of human knowledge form in reality a continuous whole, one branch gradually merging into another; thus, while a collection of use for the advance of historical knowledge seems wholly distinct from a collection of use for the advance of zoological knowledge, the two are brought together by a collection of use for the advance of archaeological knowledge, which, on the one hand, touches geology and even zoology, and on the other hand history. A common governing body, it may be said, would be best fitted to secure the interests of each.

But whatever advantages might thus be gained are counterbalanced by the disadvantages due to the differences between the several branches of knowledge. The ways of the man of science, be he zoologist, botanist, or geologist, are at bottom very different from those of the historian, however much the latter may be led to make use of archaeological knowledge. The one has great difficulty in appreciating the views, and putting himself in the place of the other; each resents being governed by the other. A large governing body attempting to rule a number of diverging, and often contending interests, undertakes a task of great difficulty; and its very constitution often invites failure. As was said above, the State itself is as competent as any other body to decide how much of the public money should be spent on this object, and how much on that; it ought to be willing, and indeed anxious to do this. The funds being thus allotted, there is everything to be said in favour, not of placing all the great national collections under one large unmanageable governing body, which must, by the force of circumstances, depute its functions, but of placing each great

collection under a small governing body specially fitted to do its particular work.

The Natural History Museum is a collection large enough and important enough, even if it were converted into a purely zoological one, the botanical, mineralogical, and geological (as distinguished from palæontological) collections being separated from it, to have an independent governing body of its own. On that body, as was said above, the State and science should both be represented; and the representatives of each should be so chosen as to secure the presence, on the one hand, of men of business capacity and habits, and on the other, of men fitted by their special knowledge and by their scientific experience to be always in touch with the work and with the staff of the Museum, able to appreciate what is wanted, and competent to judge of proposals for its development.

We may now compare the constitution and conduct of a museum, thus roughly sketched out according to theoretical considerations, with the actually existing constitution and conduct of the Museum, determined as these have been by the process of evolution. Is the present administration of the Natural History Museum the best fitted to ensure that its great and important functions are carried out as they ought to be?

In the first place, if the considerations put forward above have any validity, it is clear that the body of Trustees, as at present constituted, does not supply the best form of government. The Trustees may be described as, in part, persons chosen as giving dignity to the institution, namely, the Cabinet Ministers and others of high rank. It cannot be expected that these should take an active part in the administration. Others of the Trustees, those by family appointment, may in like manner be described as complimentary. The only Trustees who can be regarded as truly business Trustees are the four presidents of the societies and the elected fifteen; but there are no formal safeguards guaranteeing the fitness of the latter for their difficult and important functions. It may be urged that the Trustees, as a body, do not conduct the business of the Museum; they depute this to the standing committee. But they are the governing body, for they hold regular quarterly meetings at which the standing

committee reports its proceedings. And, the standing committee being chosen from the Trustees, the want of adequate formal guarantees of fitness applies also to the members of it. Some such guarantee, though perhaps not of the best, might have been afforded by making the four presidents of societies *ex officio* members of the standing committee; but this has not been done. One bright feature of the present constitution of the Trustees is that it induced His Majesty, while Prince of Wales, and is inducing the present Prince of Wales, to take an active share in the conduct of the Museum. The great value of this cannot well be overstated; it is indeed of great moment for letters and science that the heir to the throne should thus directly handle great national literary and scientific undertakings. But for such a royal co-operation surely the present constitution of the governing body is not an absolute necessity.

The Trustees as at present appointed might perform useful functions as a Board of Visitors, carrying out a general superintendence, or available for advice when needed, but they do not supply the best form of direct government. This is no new view. Again and again the fitness of the Trustees for the duties entrusted to them has been called in question. So far back as 1850, a Royal Commission, appointed to enquire into the conduct of the Museum, reported in favour of attaching 'to a limited number of competent persons a direct responsibility for the effective administration of the affairs of the Museum.' They proposed to retain the Trustees, but to limit their duties to those of a Board of Visitors, and to entrust the actual conduct of the Museum to a small 'executive council.' Forcibly impressed, as indeed everybody must be, with the anomaly of the powers of appointment given to the three Principal Trustees, they insisted that the effective administration of the Museum by such an executive council could not be carried out 'unless that body were invested with the power, hitherto exercised by the Principal Trustees, of appointing to the various offices of the Museum.'

What was wanted fifty years ago is wanted to-day—the government of the Museum 'by a limited number of competent persons,' that is, of persons chosen to bear office by reason of their fitness to perform duties demand-

ing great special knowledge as well as great judgment. If, fifty years ago, the high positions by virtue of which the three Principal Trustees hold office did not seem to fit them to appoint to the various offices, and so, in a way, to rule the whole Museum, largely literary in character, what is to be said to-day as to those high positions fitting men to rule a purely scientific institution?

But indeed, if any change is made in the government of the Museum, then assuredly, if the considerations urged a little while back are of any value, the Museum should be looked upon, not as a single institution, but as at least two; the government of the Natural History Museum ought to be wholly independent of that of the Library and of the Museum at Bloomsbury. This again is no new idea. The Royal Commission on Scientific Instruction and the Advancement of Science, appointed in 1870, in their fourth Report, dated January 16, 1874, made the following recommendations:—

‘12. After due consideration of the question, your Commissioners are of opinion that the objections to the present system of government of the British Museum, by a Board of Trustees as at present constituted, so far as relates to the Natural History Collections, are well founded; and we have been unable to discover that the system is attended by any compensating advantages.

‘13. We accordingly recommend that the occasion of the removal of those Collections to a separate building in a different locality should be taken advantage of to effect a change in the Governing Authority and Official Administration of the Natural History Division of the Museum, in the sense indicated by several of the witnesses.

‘We further recommend—

‘That a Director of the National Collections of the Natural History Department should be appointed by the Crown, and should have the entire Administration of the Establishment under the control of a Minister of State, to whom he should be immediately responsible.

‘16. That a Board of Visitors be constituted. That this Board be nominated in part by the Crown, in part by the Royal and certain other Scientific Societies of the Metropolis, and, in the first instance in part also by the Board of Trustees. . . .’

These recommendations were made in vain; but what was recommended more than a quarter of a century ago is even more urgently needed to-day. An independent government of the British Museum (Natural History) is one of the most pressing scientific needs of the time. We have already offered such general suggestions as may be made without presumption with respect to the constitution of such a new governing body.

The mere appointment, however, of a governing body, however fit, however capable, would not be in itself sufficient to secure that the great collections are put to their full use. Such a governing body must have a free hand to make such changes as it thinks desirable in the administration of the Museum. We may feel assured that it would decide that the trammels of the Civil Service system should be done away with. At present this system obtains throughout the whole establishment; promotion by seniority and the performance of routine duties are the dominant features. At present a young man joins the staff by examination, becoming a second-class assistant. In due time he may become a first-class assistant, the instances of men becoming first-class assistants without previous examination and without previous service being extremely rare. If he be very fortunate, he may become an assistant-keeper and finally a keeper, all the present keepers having been formerly assistant-keepers; but the majority are content to perform in a routine way their routine duties of determining species, waiting for the happy time when they shall deserve their pension and need determine species no more.

A great deal of valuable routine work has been and is being done by the staff; but, as was pointed out above, much at least of the determination of species could be done far more economically and far more effectively by another system. Much valuable work, not of a routine kind, but of a high scientific character, has also been done and is being done by various members of the staff; but this cannot be placed to the credit of the system; it has been done, so to speak, in spite of the system, and may be regarded as a happy omen of what might be accomplished in more favourable circumstances. The Museum ought to be able to attract to itself the best talent in the land, and ought to afford opportunities for the exercise

of that talent; this it can never do so long as seniority of service and the rigid exaction of the performance of routine duties remain dominant features. When a post, whatever be its importance, has to be filled, whether it be that of assistant, assistant-keeper, or keeper, the governing body ought to have a free hand to choose the particular man best fitted for the task, whether he already hold a post in the Museum or not. Recent events have shown acutely how difficult such a choice is made by the Civil Service rules.

As was urged above, the freer method adopted in our universities, which we have called the academic method, and which, while fully appreciating past services and the claims of seniority, is not blindly led by these, but seeks for the best man whencesoever he may come, is the one under which alone adequate scientific progress can be expected. And such a method, as shown by several examples, though unhappily not to be seen in all cases, is not incompatible with the one alluring feature of the Civil Service system—that of at least promising to secure a haven when the power to do the best work begins to wane.

Another result of the present system which is prejudicial to science is that the staff forms more or less a closed ring; it does its work more or less apart from the rest of the world of science. By this it is not meant that the members of the staff are not active members of scientific societies, for many of them are so; or that they do not bring the results of their labours before their scientific brethren, for this they do. But the main part, if not all, of their work is done in the seclusion of the Museum. Every man of science, while working in the academic class-room, museum, or laboratory, or even in the lecture-room, is strengthened and encouraged by the presence, at once stimulating and guiding, of his scholars. He feels that without these his mind would be in danger of getting entangled in cobwebs. The eager questions, the apt remarks, nay, even the silent faces of his pupils, serve to brush all cobwebs away; and the knowledge that, as he is working surrounded by learners, he is not only advancing science himself but forming a school which, even if it be small, will carry on his work after him, gives him a strength greater than his own.

The lonely worker in the Natural History Museum has no such help. He has no chance of forming a school; there is no one near him to spur him or to correct him, and cobwebs thicken round him. This, again, is not the place to enter upon the details of how the academic method should be applied to the administration of the Museum; how, in the appointment and remuneration of all the members of the staff, regard should be had not merely to the performance of routine duties, though this must be adequately secured, but also and chiefly to utilising fully the almost boundless opportunities of the Museum. The work of the Museum should be made alive and kept alive by the air of outside scientific activity blowing continually through its walls.

We are content to put the whole case as follows. Never more than at the present time was there, in the interests not of science only, but of the public at large, greater and more crying need that wide general problems of biological science should be solved, and that as speedily as may be. We need only point to the great problems of heredity; even the man in the street is aware of the far-reaching social and industrial consequences hanging on the true solutions of these problems. So urgent are these problems, that we hear on many sides loud demands that the public money should be spent in support of the abstract investigations through which alone we can hope to reach the solutions. And so with many other problems. A very large sum of public money is spent yearly on the Natural History Museum. Great and valuable as is the work done in the Museum under present conditions, it would be increased many fold were its government and administration modified in character and brought into closer touch with scientific life, so that the work done there might be more directly devoted to wide biological investigation. In the treasures of the Museum lie the keys to many scientific locks; but the locks will never be opened by routine handling. The nation has the right to demand that all possible efforts should be made to secure the best use of the keys.

Art. X.—THE REGULATION OF MOTOR-CARS.

1. *Report of the Royal Commission on Motor-cars and Minutes of Evidence taken* [Cd. 3080, 3081]. London: Wyman, 1906.
2. *Report from the Select Committee on the Cabs and Omnibuses (Metropolis) Bill*. Presented to the House of Commons, July 31, 1906.
3. *Motors and Motor-driving*. (Badminton Library.) Edited by Lord Northcliffe. Fourth edition, revised throughout. London: Longmans, 1906.

THERE is no doubt that 'motors' have come to stay. Nor will men of a progressive turn of mind regret the fact. The utility, the convenience, and the general advantages of motor-cars are so obvious that it is almost unnecessary to dilate upon them; and the man who would willingly prevent their development would take a heavy load of responsibility upon his shoulders. No reasonably minded motorist will deny, however, that the comfort and safety of all his Majesty's subjects is, and ought to be, a matter of grave consideration. To reconcile, therefore, the development of the use of motor-cars with existing rights and interests is well worthy of the attention of the Legislature; and it seems to us that a satisfactory solution will never be arrived at if terms of abuse are to take the place of arguments, and catch-phrases to be substituted for truthful descriptions.

That the use of our roads by motor-cars must be regulated by legislation will be admitted by every one. Motorists have received the whole of the privileges they now enjoy by means of recent legislation; their common-law rights, if indeed they possess any, being of such a restricted character as to be absolutely worthless. In the era of toll-gates, for instance, it was legal to impose rates of toll which were practically prohibitory. Mr Gurney is said to have been the first person to use mechanical means of locomotion on the roads of England. So far back as the year 1829 he travelled from London to Bath and back in his steam carriage; and though, owing to a break-down, he was unable to use his engine at its full capacity, he performed the last eighty-four miles of

his journey, including stoppages, in ten hours. The rates of toll he was called upon to pay were certainly extortionate. Thus on the Liverpool and Prescott Road he was charged 2*l.* 8*s.*, whilst a loaded stage-coach would only pay 4*s.* On the Ashburnham and Totnes Road he had to pay 2*l.*, while a coach drawn by four horses was only charged 3*s.* By means such as these, and also through violently restrictive legislation, the early development of motor-cars in this country was prevented; nor was it until 1896 that a more reasonable spirit began to prevail. In that year motorists received the first instalment of the privileges of which they are now possessed. By the Act of 1896 there was fixed an absolute maximum of fourteen miles an hour for speed, with power to the central authority to reduce the maximum by regulations. Other provisions for the protection of the public were also inserted, such as the use of a lamp at night, and of a bell or other instrument for giving warning of approach.

The passing of this Act was immediately followed by a great development in the use of motor-cars; and in a very few years afterwards a practically universal demand for further legislation was made both by the motorists and the general public. The demand was met in the year 1903, when Mr Walter Long introduced the Act by means of which the use of motor-cars is regulated at the present moment. It is important to remember that this Act, as originally introduced, contained no speed-limit; and Mr Long's main argument in favour of its abolition was the statement that the police were against a restriction.

'Obviously' (said Mr Walter Long) 'it has been my business to consult the best authorities on the subject—those who have to carry the law into effect. The police, for instance, have had more personal experience than anybody else; and I may say at once that a very great majority of the chief constables in the country are of opinion that the proposals of the Bill, without a speed-limit, are more likely to secure the effective control of motors than with a speed-limit.'

It is evident that either Mr Long's information was obtained from defective sources, or that the police have now adopted a different attitude, for on page 9 of the Report of the Royal Commission we read, 'The chief constables of counties who gave us their evidence were

distinctly in favour of retaining a general speed-limit.' However that may be, neither Mr Long's statement, nor his interesting arguments in support of it, succeeded in convincing the then House of Commons that it was desirable to do away with a speed-limit. Speakers on both sides of the House declared their intention of voting against the second reading of the Bill if the Government persisted in their original design; and Mr Long speedily found that he would be obliged either to abandon his guns, or lose his Bill and submit to a Government defeat. Like every wise minister under similar circumstances, he decided immediately that the defeat of his Government would be a calamity too great to be borne by the country. He promised to insert a speed-limit in committee, provided that the breach of it should not carry the penalty of imprisonment. The compromise was accepted; the Bill passed its second reading without a division, and a speed-limit of twenty miles per hour was subsequently inserted in committee.

It seems rather cruel to refer to the hopes and anticipations of the author of the Bill with regard to his offspring. But, having regard to the fact that we shall shortly be called upon to legislate with regard to the same subject, and that 'once bitten is twice shy,' it is necessary to do so, in order to show, not how the thing ought to be done, but how it ought not to be done. Mr Long emphatically denied that his object in promoting the Bill was to help the users of motor-cars.

'The reason that we have asked Parliament to consider this Bill at so late a period of the session' (said he) 'is one which every man who looks into the history of the question must easily recognise for himself. Twelve months ago the passage of such a Bill would have been easy; but latterly, in the last six months, there is no doubt that public feeling has been greatly excited by what I can only describe as the disgraceful abuse of their rights and privileges by many users of motor-cars. It is not only the security of life and limb that has to be dealt with, but also the extraordinary discomfort suffered by people who live on the roads which motors largely frequent. Many houses alongside the public roads have been rendered almost uninhabitable, not only by the dust, which is an intolerable nuisance in the summer months, but by other inconveniences which follow from the improper use of this

means of conveyance. It is in order to deal with those difficulties that the Government have thought it their duty to introduce the Bill to Parliament.'

No one will deny that the difficulties Mr Long proposed to settle still remain unsettled, and that the clamant grievances of 1906 call with an even louder voice than in 1903. To tell the truth, however, the Government of the day perceived, before the Bill had passed through all its stages in the House of Commons, that it could not be looked upon as a final settlement of the matter. An amendment was moved in committee that the Act should only continue in force until December 31, 1906, unless the House should otherwise determine. The consequence is that the Government must either pass another Motor Bill this autumn, which they are extremely unlikely to do, or continue the operation of the present Act for another year under the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill.

The Act of 1903 had not been in force for more than eighteen months when it became apparent that a considerable spirit of discontent with its provisions existed throughout the country. This spirit of discontent found expression in an important debate which took place in the House of Commons in the month of June 1905. In the course of that debate Mr Gerald Balfour (who had succeeded Mr Long as President of the Local Government Board) frankly admitted that the Act of 1903 had not fulfilled the anticipations of the Government.

'He realised' (he said) 'that public opinion had been greatly stirred by the danger of motor-cars when recklessly or negligently driven, and by the accidents that had occurred. In addition there was the intolerable nuisance of dust to dwellers by the roadside. Difficulties had to be met without unduly checking the use of motor-cars. Something could be done by Local Government Board administration, more by increased stringency on the part of local authorities and the police, and a good deal by legislation.'

In the course of his speech Mr Gerald Balfour promised the appointment of the Royal Commission whose Report now lies before us for consideration; and the Government thus succeeded in staving off what would certainly have been an awkward division. In order to test the reality

of the expressed desires of those gentlemen who had spoken strongly with regard to dangerous driving, Mr Soares subsequently introduced a short Bill to amend the Act of 1903. This Bill gave power to the magistrates to inflict the penalty of imprisonment for the first offence on any man who should drive recklessly, negligently, or dangerously. The first reading of this Bill was opposed by Mr Scott Montagu (now Lord Montagu of Beaulieu), but was nevertheless carried by 222 to 58. Amongst those voting in favour of the Bill were the present Prime Minister and many members of his Government; and it is therefore reasonable to anticipate that, in framing a new measure, the safety of the public will have their earnest consideration. The Bill was blocked at its subsequent stages by representative members of the Automobile Club, and therefore merely remains as a pious expression of opinion on the part of the last Parliament.

What the effect of the general election may be on the controversy now under discussion remains to be proved. That the conduct of some of the motoring publications during that election was reprehensible, will, we think, be admitted by every fair-minded politician. Every member of Parliament who had taken an active part in the protection of the interests of the public was black-listed; and a determined attempt was made to prevent him from regaining his seat. No motor-cars were to be lent to him for the purposes of his election, and a system of boycott was to be introduced. A question of such importance to the country as Free-trade and Tariff Reform was to be ignored by patriotic motorists; and the issue to be substituted was that of their own interests, their own pleasures, and their own amusements.

What, then, is the present political situation? The general election is over; the opinions of a large number of the members of the present House of Commons on the main points of the controversy are either unknown or unformed; the Report of the Royal Commission is presented for our consideration; and, before new legislation can be attempted, we have plenty of time at our disposal within which to discuss the question in all its bearings. Now, with regard to the Report of the Royal Commission, we may as well at once enter a caveat against the treatment of its findings as a verbally inspired document. On most

of the points in discussion in the present controversy a man of average intelligence can form his own opinions from his own personal experience; and it is a matter of considerable doubt as to whether a Royal Commission was really required or not. At the same time we cannot fail to recognise that the members of the Commission have carried out their duties in an honourable and painstaking manner; and that, if the product of their labours is by no means final or exhaustive, they have, at any rate, earned our gratitude for the time and attention they have devoted to the matter.

The nature of the problem which confronted the Royal Commission and now confronts the Legislature is as follows—how to place on the roads of this country traffic capable of moving from fifteen to fifty miles an hour amongst traffic accustomed to move at from three to ten miles an hour. Now it will be readily admitted that our roads, whether in town or country, were not originally designed for swiftly moving traffic. Like our illogical constitution, they have grown up slowly and casually in accordance with the needs of the people. The Roman roads were planned with a view to military exigencies only, whilst the other roads were evolved as means of communication, and developed *pari passu* with the development of traffic. We find them twisting and turning in all directions—here to avoid a steep gradient, there to dodge a piece of bog-land, and there again to find the easiest place to ford some stream which has long since ceased to flow. We find them constantly intersected by cross-roads, most of them at a direct right-angle and absolutely hidden from view at the distance of a few yards. High hedges or banks usually serve as their boundaries on either side, made not only to prevent the straying of cattle on the roads, but also to serve as shelter on the lee side in open or exposed positions. That some few of our roads possess a perfectly open and straightforward view for considerable distances is true; but it is submitted that the benefit in these cases is conferred accidentally, owing to the fortuitous lie of the country, and not with the object of obtaining the uninterrupted view. When one remembers that most of our byroads were originally made for saddle-horse and pack-horse traffic, and that a stage-coach was the fastest

vehicle in the minds of the designers of our turnpike roads, one cannot help sympathising, at any rate, with the views of those people who regard with alarm the prospect of these unsuitably planned roads being habitually used by traffic moving at a rate of speed which has hitherto been confined to railroads.

This portion of the subject is referred to by the Royal Commission, though it cannot be contended that any great amount of illumination is shed upon it. The Commissioners suggest that local authorities should acquire the right, by agreement or purchase, of dealing with any banks, hedges, or similar pieces of land near highways in order to clear away obstructions to the view at corners, cross-roads, and similar dangerous places. We are inclined to think that the recommendation is superfluous, as the power is already possessed by local authorities. But, even if it were not, its possession would not take us much further. The difficulty would lie in the unwillingness of the ordinary non-motoring ratepayer to put his hand in his pocket for the purposes suggested, for no one in his senses would contend that the produce of the suggested increase of licence duties would be sufficient even to deal with the dust problem alone. That this is the case a very short consideration of the figures furnished by the Royal Commission itself will sufficiently demonstrate.

The county councils expend on the maintenance, improvement, and repairs of the main roads in England and Wales about 2,400,000*l.* annually. To this must be added the large sums spent on the upkeep of roads by London, by the county boroughs, and by the rural district councils, necessarily amounting to many millions annually. The Royal Commission recommends that all money derived from the taxation of motor-cars should be handed over to some central department and should be appropriated in part payment of the cost incurred by the local authorities, not on customary repairs, but on works which have for their object the creation of more durable and less dusty road surfaces, and the removal of danger to traffic; and that it should, in the first instance, be devoted to the roads, whether technically main roads or not, which are important arteries of through communication.

The Commissioners also propose an increase in the

rate of the present licence duties on motor-cars, though they do not give us an estimate as to the probable amount which would be raised by such increase. Under the present system of taxation, we are told, the amount collected in the year 1905-6 was about 100,000*l*. Presumably this came not only from England and Wales, but also from Scotland and Ireland. The Commissioners state that, under the new rates recommended by them, this sum of 100,000*l*. would be materially increased, but do not go into further details. All we know, therefore, is that, under the scheme of the Commission, there would be a sum of something over 100,000*l*. per annum to be divided amongst the local authorities of England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales for the reconstruction of roads, the placing of danger-signals at necessary places, and for the clearing away of obstructions to the view. Having regard to the fact that millions are now spent on the upkeep of the roads of England and Wales alone, is it not obvious that this sum, when distributed, would amount to a mere drop in the bucket of local expenditure? It would certainly not be sufficient for even the extra expense of putting up danger-signals, lopping hedges, and clearing away obstructions to view. The scheme of the Commission would be altogether inadequate to carry out the objects at which they aim, and would scarcely justify the complicated system of accounts which its adoption would necessarily involve.

There is, moreover, another point of view from which the taxation of motor-cars must be regarded, namely, the point of view of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. As the Commissioners themselves admit, the tax, whether increased or not, is in the nature of a sumptuary tax. It is levied on the principle that the burden of taxation should be borne by those most capable of bearing it; it comes under the heading of the taxation of luxuries, and must therefore inevitably be extended to its greatest revenue capacity. That the limit of taxation is not yet reached is proved by the fact that almost every motorist in the country is willing to pay an extra amount, provided he is permitted to allocate the revenue to purposes which he considers desirable. That in these circumstances the Chancellor of the Exchequer will seize the opportunity of increasing his budget by the suggested extra amount is

almost a foregone conclusion. But would he permit, or will the House of Commons permit, the revenue derived from it to be ear-marked in the manner suggested? If the motorist for pleasure is to be permitted to allocate his share of taxation in order that his amusement may be carried on with more convenience and safety, why should not other taxpayers have a similar privilege? Is the man who pays a game-licence to be allowed to allocate his tax for the payment of extra policemen to assist his game-keepers to watch his coverts and prevent poaching?

That one political party is always ready to accuse another political party of using the public funds improperly is a regrettable fact; and the Chancellor of the Exchequer who will boldly stand out as the champion of the policy of 'Doles to Wealthy Motorists' will certainly be more remarkable for his courage than for his discretion. The resources of the Chancellor of the Exchequer are dependent upon the taxable capacities of the country; and, if it is decided to expend money on improving the roads, it is immaterial, so far as he is concerned, whether the money is raised by the tea-duty or by a tax on motor-cars. The present Government, at any rate, has such an urgent need of money to carry out its many projects for the benefit of the working-classes that it is hardly likely to let slip so peculiarly suitable a subject of taxation as a motor-car used for pleasure; and those motoring gentlemen who are indulging in pleasant dreams with regard to the expenditure of the taxes they are or may be compelled to pay will probably have a rude and rough awakening in a Radical House of Commons.

With regard, therefore, to the grave question of the dust nuisance, the Report of the Royal Commission gives us practically no help whatever. They tell us, it is true, that, if better and more expensive materials were used in road-making, the roads would be better; but even the humblest member of the smallest rural district council hardly needed a Royal Commission to give him this information. They say, in a hesitating manner, that it is possible that increased expenditure may turn out to be true economy in the end; but, as they themselves admit, 'on the question of economy they find themselves unable to express any definite opinion, partly because the conditions vary in different counties, and partly because there has

not been time for a satisfactory test.' The Commissioners are evidently of opinion that the dust preventives which are used both at home and abroad have still got their reputation to make; and they rightly rule out of consideration the adoption of the French tarring process, of which we have heard so much, as being too expensive for application, costing annually, as it does, from 40% to 50% a mile for an 18-ft. road.

That no satisfactory remedy is offered by the Commission for this all-important evil is a matter of grave concern; for the dust nuisance steadily grows, and is intensified by every new motor-car put on the road. We have quoted Mr Long in 1903, and Mr Gerald Balfour in 1905; in 1906 the Commissioners report:

'There is no doubt at all about the dust nuisance; during the summer months it exists more or less on all frequented roads, but more particularly on the great main roads, and within a radius of thirty or forty miles of London, and it causes material damage, discomfort, and annoyance to users of, and dwellers by, the highways.'

The Commissioners give us some of the evidence on which they formed their opinion; and no one who keeps his eyes open can say that it is either exaggerated or highly-coloured. Take, for instance, the evidence of Mr J. Drysdale, a tenant-farmer of Stirlingshire, and one of the representatives of the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture. He quoted the answers sent in by agricultural societies all over Scotland affiliated to his Chamber, the general tenour of them being as follows:—

'Considerable injury has been done to hedges by dust.' 'Hay and grain crops are rendered dangerous as feeding for livestock by fine dust adhering to them.' 'Hedges and crops near roads get covered by dust; it ruins hay.' 'Cattle seldom grazed on pasture next roads,' etc.

That the grievance of the tenant-farmers is a genuine one is proved by its corroboration at the hands of the market-gardeners. Mr Steel, for instance, a market-gardener of Brentford, says:

'The effect of the dust from motor-cars is so to destroy the marketable value of the produce on either side of the road, more particularly fruit, flowers, and salads, that growers have frequently complained to me.'

It would be impossible, within the limits of a single article, to do adequate justice to the complaints made by various classes of small, hard-working tradesmen as to the injury inflicted by dust. Their grievances from time to time become articulate in the Press. Instances of damage to house-property also, much of which is owned by men of scanty means, might be multiplied indefinitely. In fact, there is no doubt whatever as to the seriousness of the nuisance. Not only, however, is injury caused to property, to productive trades and distributing trades, but the health of foot-passengers and the general amenities of the roads have been seriously affected. Giving evidence before the Royal Commission, Mr Breathwaite, a railway signalman at Elstree, said :

'I have gone out for a Sunday afternoon's walk with my wife and family, and come home as if I had come out of a flour-mill. The dust has been raised by motors, and it has been something terrific; and instead of coming home with an appetite for your tea, and feeling benefited by your country walk, you come home tired and jaded and irritated; in fact you feel that you wish you had not gone out at all.'

What, then, can fairly be deduced both from the Report of the Commission and the evidence accompanying it? Is it not, that a large number of the poorer classes of the community, tenant-farmers, small tradesmen, working-men living by the roadside, and users of the road both for business and health, are suffering from an intolerable and grievous nuisance? So far, it is true, the restraint of both their actions and their language has been as commendable as it is remarkable. But that it will always be so, that these injured men will permit the nuisance to continue and be intensified, is incredible. It is evident that the dust nuisance must be tackled in a resolute manner; and the *laissez-faire* policy of the past few years must come to a definite end. There is no need to appeal to class prejudice in the matter; but we must bear in mind the fact that the owners of motor-cars will always be a small minority of the users of the roads. A very large proportion of motors are now, and always will be, used for purposes of pleasure and recreation merely. We can practically eliminate from our calculations the number of motor-cars used by

doctors and other professional men, for these cars are of necessity used in the places in which their owners carry on their business; and, inasmuch as popularity is as essential to a doctor as it is to a politician, we may be quite sure that their cars will be used with a minimum of nuisance and a maximum of courtesy. It must also be remembered that motor-cars used for purposes of trade, for the carriage of agricultural produce, and in other useful ways, are not seriously in fault, so far, at any rate, as the dust nuisance is concerned. To none of them is a high rate of speed essential; and the Royal Commission reports:

'Speaking generally, we came to the conclusion that, at a speed below ten miles an hour, the dust raised is comparatively slight; that it increases very greatly at from, say, twelve to twenty miles an hour, and continues to increase, but in a smaller proportion, at higher speeds.'

We find, then—and most fair-minded men will admit the truth of the statement—that the people mainly responsible for the creation of the dust nuisance are wealthy folk who use motors for recreation and pleasure. '*Sic utere tuo ut alienum non lædas*' is a maxim of great weight, and seems to apply with peculiar force to the present situation. That the pleasure of one class cannot be permitted to interfere with the health and livelihood of a much larger class is a truth of which Parliament will be bound to take cognisance; and, when next year this question comes up for decision, it will have to aim, as in all other legislation of the present era, at the promotion of the greatest good of the greatest number.

The other branch of the controversy, on which there is certain to be a considerable amount of hot disputation, is the question of the speed-limit. Ought there to be a speed-limit, or ought there not? Does it merely give an opening to malice, hatred, and perjury, or is it a means of protection for the public safety? It may be admitted at once that much valuable information is furnished by the Royal Commission on this head, though it seems to have led the majority of the Commissioners to vague and illogical conclusions. Nothing could be more helpful than the extremely able and interesting report of Captain Clive Bigham, the secretary of the Commission, on the law and

practice as to motor-cars in the principal foreign countries. The information contained in this Report has been asked for over and over again in the House of Commons, but hitherto has not been vouchsafed to us. Its importance can easily be seen when we recall an argument which has been frequently used in the course of debate, viz. that owing to the less stringent conditions in the use of motor-cars in foreign countries, the foreign manufacturer has a considerable advantage over his British competitor. The report of Captain Bigham disposes once for all of this contention. France, for instance, the most serious competitor of the British manufacturer, has a general speed-limit of $18\frac{1}{2}$ miles an hour, reduced to $12\frac{1}{2}$ miles an hour in inhabited places, and to 4 miles an hour in narrow or crowded places. Austria has found it necessary to abandon her old law of no speed-limit, and by an Act which came into force at the commencement of the present year has enacted a speed-limit of 28 miles in the open country, of 9 miles in inhabited places, and of 5 miles in narrow, winding roads and other places where speed would be dangerous.

In Germany, it is true, somewhat different ideas appear to prevail, for the Federal Council has just recommended to the different States certain regulations which lay down no speed-limit in open places and a limit of about 9 miles an hour in inhabited places; but, since these regulations were to come into force only on October 1 in the present year, we can have no guidance as to their efficiency or the reverse. If, on the other hand, we turn to another continent, and to a country renowned for the go-ahead spirit of its legislation, we find that five-sixths of the United States have maximum speed-limits averaging $18\frac{1}{2}$ miles an hour on open roads, and 10 miles an hour in inhabited places. Having regard, therefore, to this fact, and to the fact that all the principal European countries, with the exception of Germany and the Netherlands, have maximum speed-limits, it is clear that the British manufacturer will have no cause of complaint if Parliament should decide in favour of the continuance of a maximum speed-limit in this country.

The Royal Commission is not unanimous on this question of a general speed-limit. Sir E. R. Henry (Commissioner of Police of the metropolis) and Mr H. C.

Monro (assistant secretary of the Local Government Board) present a 'reservation,' in which they say that the interests of the general public appear to them to demand that a general speed-limit shall continue to be part of the law, so that it may be applicable when required; and it is obvious that the opinion of these two gentlemen deserves special attention, since, owing to their positions, they have a wide experience as to the manner in which a speed-limit works out in actual practice.

The majority of the Royal Commission recommends that the present general speed-limit of 20 miles an hour should be abolished, but that in towns, villages, or 'other more or less continuous collection of houses along the highway,' or at dangerous corners, steep hills, and other places in which special caution is required, there should be a 12-mile speed-limit, where adopted by the local authorities. This recommendation appears to be both vague and illogical. It is vague because no one can possibly define what is meant by 'a more or less continuous collection of houses along the highway,' or by the words 'other places where special caution is required.' It is also difficult to know what they mean by their recommendation that the new Act should make it explicitly clear that 'speed may be an element of danger,' and how far this conflicts with the proposed abolition of the speed-limit. Their Report is illogical because, although they propose a speed-limit in villages, they state that 'police control' is very difficult to work in a public street; in other words, they recommend a law the detection of whose infraction would, in their opinion, be almost impossible. The Commissioners also report that the new Act should contain an express provision against racing on a highway. Very laudable, but again slightly difficult of comprehension. Do they mean racing against another car only, or do they include racing against time? If the latter, then it looks as if some new and undesirable rules will have to be introduced into English jurisprudence whereby a criminal would be compelled to give evidence in order to secure his own conviction.

The question, however, as to whether high rates of speed shall be legalised on our public roads will not be settled by the report of any Commission, but by the votes

of the representatives of the people in the House of Commons. That our roads were not designed for this purpose has already been shown ; and that the higher the speed the greater the dust nuisance is admitted by every one. But there are other considerations which must have weight and force when the matter comes on for decision. The higher the speed, the greater becomes the difficulty of stopping the car in moments of danger, and the greater and more serious becomes an accident arising from skidding or side-slip. It must be remembered, too, that no test for efficiency is demanded in England before the issue of a driving-licence. To any one, competent or incompetent, cautious or reckless, of drunken or sober habits, the payment of a small sum of money secures the right to drive. That the public are sufficiently protected by the desire of the driver of a car to secure his own safety will appear an absurd argument to any one acquainted with human nature. Every sportsman constantly risks his life in the pursuit of his amusements ; and motorists do not differ from other people in this respect. As for pecuniary claims arising from injury done to other users of the road, provision is made for these by insurance ; and, by taking out a third-party policy, a motorist may cause accidents to the annual value of 1000*l.* a year without any monetary loss to himself.

The abolition of the speed-limit is mainly demanded by the wealthier class of motorist. When wealth meets wealth a low speed-limit is at once insisted upon, as in the royal parks of London. But surely the altruistic spirit of the age will not be altogether neglectful of the humble inhabitants of the country-side. Are the mothers of our rural children to be compelled to restrict them from using the roads as they have hitherto been accustomed to do ? Are the children of an agricultural labourer, living by the roadside, to be confined within the four walls of his cottage during the whole of a lovely summer day ? Surely not. The majority of Parliament will doubtless care more for the rosy cheeks of our country children than for titillating the nerves of some wealthy Lucullus. A speed-limit is good because it ensures a reasonable rate of speed on all our roads ; and any one exceeding it should be brought within the category of law-breaker. With many, it is true, this is a consideration

of little or no importance ; but the majority of the people of England are of a law-abiding nature ; and there are thousands of motorists who are restrained by the present law, even though they would like, in their own interests, to see the speed-limit abolished.

So far we have dealt with the question of the speed of light motor-cars only ; but of course the question of the speed of heavy motor-cars is equally serious. Here, however, the Commissioners appear to have arrived at conclusions in which, we think, they will be supported by the general public. They recommend that the present limit of 12 miles an hour should be adhered to, except in the case of cars weighing from two to three tons and having non-resilient tyres, which, they rightly consider, should be reduced to a limit of 5 miles an hour. In this opinion the Commissioners are supported by the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Cabs and Omnibuses (Metropolis), whose interesting Report was published in July of the present year. This Committee not only considers that the present speed-limit of 12 miles an hour is sufficient, but calls attention to the fact that it is at present frequently exceeded, and demands closer police supervision. So far as we are aware, neither the manufacturers nor the proprietors of heavy cars are asking for an increase of the speed-limit ; and we may take it therefore that on this point, at any rate, there is practical unanimity.

Here again, then, is an illustration of the fact that a high rate of speed is not required for utilitarian purposes ; for it cannot be denied that it is mainly in the improvement and development of the heavy kinds of motor-cars that the public hope to find some recompense for all the evils that they are at present called upon to endure. In rural districts especially it is to be hoped that this class of traffic will become more general and less expensive. If the proposed extension of the system of small holdings is to be successful, it will be found to be absolutely essential that the occupier should be placed in close touch either with the railway or some large centre of population. If he is to dispose of his eggs, his chickens, and his butter on favourable terms, and at fair market prices, he must have a reasonable and constant means of access to his customers. Many of us believe that this could be effected

in an economic and expeditious manner by means of a service of heavy motor-cars, which would run into scattered villages and hamlets and collect agricultural produce either daily or bi-weekly, as the case may require. A service of this kind, whether carried out by the Post-office or by an agricultural co-operative society, would undoubtedly prove of immense benefit to the whole country-side; and rural ratepayers would get some return for the damage inflicted upon their roads.

As things stand at present, we doubt whether there is a rural road authority in the United Kingdom which has not passed indignant resolutions with regard to the burden imposed upon them by the increased cost of the maintenance of their roads owing to motor-car traffic. What the precise amount of the burden may be is very difficult to estimate; and very few surveyors can be found who are willing to undertake the task. Mr Copnall, however, who is clerk to the Nottingham County Council, and was nominated by the County Councils Association to give evidence before the Royal Commission, states that the cost of the maintenance of the main roads in Nottinghamshire has steadily increased within the last ten years, which may be taken as the motor period. Between 1902-3 and 1904-5 the cost of maintenance had increased by 10% per mile; and he estimates that, if the heavy traffic continues to increase in the same proportion, it will not be long before the cost of maintenance is nearly double what it was in 1900. In Mr Copnall's opinion this increase of cost is due wholly and solely to the increase of locomotive and motor traffic, and is not owing either to an increase in horse traffic, to increased cost of labour or road materials, or anything else.

It is an admitted fact that other counties besides Nottinghamshire are suffering under a similar state of affairs; and it is not to be wondered at that the voice of the ratepayer is making itself heard at the various district council meetings. It is perfectly true that the main portion of the damage must be laid at the doors of the heavier forms of traffic. The light motor-cars have a considerable disintegrating effect on all roads except those of the highest class; but, except where they are present in large numbers and running constantly on the same portions of the road, it is doubtful whether they do

more harm than an ordinary carriage and the eight iron-shod hooves of the horses. With locomotives and motor-trolleys, however, the position is entirely different; the damage they inflict upon roads of all kinds and descriptions is of a most serious character; and, having regard to the fact that most of them are used for the purpose of profit-making for individuals, some means must be taken to make them recoup to the public the damage they occasion by the use of the public roads.

The injustice of existing conditions appears to have forced itself upon the minds of the Commissioners, though they seem inclined to shelve the matter by declaring that the question of 'extraordinary damage' caused by exceptionally heavy motor-vehicles and their loads hardly comes within the terms of their reference. How they could be of this opinion when they were appointed to enquire and report (*inter alia*) upon 'the injury of the roads alleged to be caused by motor-cars' it is somewhat difficult to understand; but at any rate we must be grateful to them for the fact that they do not leave us entirely without guidance on the matter. They speak approvingly of a suggestion that owners of heavy motor-cars using a road continuously so as to increase the cost of maintenance should be called upon to make a contribution, the amount, in case of difference of opinion, to be settled by arbitration. Inasmuch, however, as any alteration of the law to this effect would of necessity apply to locomotives as well as to motor-cars, they do not recommend that the subject should be dealt with in the coming Bill; and, if regard be had to all the circumstances of the case, the course they suggest would probably be the wisest one for the Government to take.

With regard to heavy motor-cars, however, it is not so much the question of damage to roads which is agitating the public mind, as the question of danger to life and health caused by the multiplication of motor-omnibuses in the streets of our large towns. The enormous number of accidents occasioned by these omnibuses, the terrifying manner in which they skid and slip about the greasy streets, the offensive nature of their exhausts, and their noise and vibration, are admittedly matters of the gravest concern to every inhabitant of the City of London. In the metropolitan area alone there were

400 accidents in the month of May of this year, 62 of which caused personal injuries; and in the month of June there were 390 accidents, of which 80 caused personal injuries. The figures for the past three months are not before us; but from the cases reported by the newspapers we may feel certain that these modern Juggernauts have maintained, if not increased, their monthly average of accidents. To a large extent these accidents are owing to careless and faulty construction. The demand for delivery has been so great that the manufacturers have had practically a free hand; and, as Mr. Bertram Blount recently acknowledged in the 'Westminster Gazette,' 'many of the motor-omnibuses now on the road have been simply thrown together.' When it is remembered that the safety of the people in the 'bus and that of the people on the road absolutely depends on the accurate behaviour of the complicated machinery of these heavy vehicles, it is evident that the public demand for effective tests of construction will have to be complied with.

There is no need for any further legislation in this matter; the Local Government Board has full authority to prescribe conditions both as to the use and construction of heavy motor-cars; and it is a public scandal that the matter was not taken seriously in hand by the authorities as soon as the danger became apparent. The injury done to property by noise and vibration is a grievance so universally admitted that it is unnecessary to dwell upon it here; and the eloquent fact that there has been a decline in the rates of South Kensington of no less than 5,000% during the first half of the present year needs no further comment. Eminent scientists have given us their views as to the dangerous nature of the foul and poisonous gases disseminated below the breathing level of the users of the streets; and the fogs of the coming winter threaten to offer an infinite variety of horrible choices to those unfortunate people who are compelled to live in London. It is clearly unthinkable that evils such as these can long be tolerated in any residential town.

It is perhaps not too much to hope that the new President of the Local Government Board may interfere effectively. His views on the matter may be gathered

from an article in the 'Pall Mall Magazine' which appeared over his name after he acceded to office. It is entitled 'The Tangle of London's Traffic'; and in the course of it Mr Burns says, 'As for motor-omnibuses, their cost, noise, maintenance, ubiquity of movement, and mobility of obstruction, discount them for London use, except as feeders for branch-lines of Council tramways.' No words could possibly be stronger; and, having regard to the fact that his Board is possessed of plenary powers, we may hope that the nuisance will be rigorously dealt with in the course of the next few months. We do not suggest that regulations should be issued of a kind which would drive this form of traffic off the streets of our large towns. It undoubtedly serves a public need and meets a public want, but it must be regulated in accordance with the rights of all classes of the community; and the health and safety of his Majesty's subjects must take precedence of the dividend-earning ambitions of the motor-omnibus companies.

There are many other points of interest in connexion with motor-cars, but it is impossible to deal with all of them within the limits of a single article. The Royal Commission has made some useful recommendations with regard to registration, identification, the emission of smoke, the excessive use of horns, and unnecessary vibration. These recommendations are both interesting and important, and afford proof, if proof be needed, of the care and energy brought by the Commissioners to their task. No doubt they will be carefully considered by the President of the Local Government Board when drawing up any future regulations, and receive at his hands the consideration which their intrinsic value deserves.

Art. XI.—COUNTY FAMILIES.

1. *Northamptonshire Families*. Edited by Oswald Barron. ('Victoria County Histories.') London: Constable, 1906.
2. *History of the Landed Gentry of Great Britain*. By Sir Bernard Burke, Ulster King-at-arms, and Ashworth P. Burke. Eleventh edition. London: Harrison, 1906.

'STEMMATA quid faciunt?' To those who lightly echo the gibe of the Roman satirist it may cause considerable surprise, if not a shock, to learn that four English historians have insisted in recent times on the value of honest genealogy, especially when it is combined, as in the first of the volumes mentioned above, with the study of a family's origin and rise, and of that territorial position on which insistence has here been placed. Kemble, a careful writer, went so far as to assert that

'it is indispensable to a clear view of the constitutional law and governmental institutions of this country that we should not lose sight of the distribution of landed estates among the great families, and that the rise and fall of these houses should be carefully traced and steadily borne in mind. . . . From the days of Harold to our own the succession of the landowners and the relations arising out of these successions are the running comment upon the events in our national history; they are at once the causes and the criteria of facts, and upon them has depended the development and settlement of principles in laws which still survive, in institutions which we cling to with reverence, in feelings which make up the complex of our national character.'

Palgrave followed him with testimony no less emphatic on the subject.

'Genealogical enquiries and local topography, so far from being unworthy the attention of the philosophical enquirer, are amongst the best materials which he can use; and the fortunes and changes of one family, or the events of one upland township, may explain the darkest and most dubious portions of the annals of a realm.'

Should it be urged that we have travelled far since the days of Kemble and Palgrave, that territorial position and ancient lineage alike are now but of small account either politically or socially, we may confidently reply

that the study of genealogy has by no means thereby lost its value for the social historian or its interest and charm for the public. Stubbs, with his ripe judgment and intellectual power, did not hesitate to write that

'the expansion and extension of genealogical study is a very remarkable feature of our own times. Men are apparently awaking to the fact that there are other families besides those described in the peerage; that those families have their records, played their part in history, furnished the bone and sinew of national action, and left traces behind them which it behoves their descendants to search out and keep in remembrance. There is nothing in this that need be stigmatised as vain and foolish; it is a very natural instinct, and it appears to me to be one of the ways in which a general interest in national history may be expected to grow.'

Even Freeman, for whom pedigrees possessed little attraction, remarks:

'Let no one deem that, because a false pedigree is a thing to be eschewed and scouted, therefore a true pedigree is a thing to be despised. . . . It is only the false imitation of the true which is to be despised.'

This is the spirit which animates that modern school of genealogists of whom the editor of 'Northamptonshire Families' is so brilliant a representative. As he says:

'In the first place, and the chief, we set before ourselves a high standard of truth and of good faith. Such genealogies as we record shall carry with them the proof for each generation set down, proofs drawn from trustworthy sources, from the great treasure-house of the Public Records, from inquests and wills, from parish registers and family letters, suits at law, and gravestones, and from all the hundred sources available to modern genealogy.'

The work of that school is associated, probably, in the public mind with the ruthless exposure of false genealogy, the work of many generations, rather than with such work as this volume contains—the toilsome construction of true pedigrees of the families with which it deals. If, for no other reason than its fearless honesty and candour, it may claim to stand in a class apart, to represent the work of those who know not fear or favour.

But there are other and sufficient reasons why a work

of this character deserves encouragement and welcome. The historian of social life has of late been busy in our midst, but of that life there are aspects which as yet elude his grasp. The means by which men rose from the ranks, the fate of the younger sons of landed houses in the past, the attitude of classes toward one another, the position of trade and the professions—these are but some of the points on which we have much to learn; and, if the 'Victoria History' performs for other counties the task it has accomplished for Northamptonshire, it will eventually supply the student with a great repertory of facts. As Mr Barron himself expresses it:

'The rise of a great house is shown after a fashion which may serve the historian or sociologist in his task, for whether our house rise from a careful citizen or an adventurous soldier, from a feudal lord with a banner and forty knights at his back, or from a husbandman who followed the plough-tail, the fact is here in plain words, a fact which should prove of truer and more abiding interest to the descendants of the house-founder than could any lying entry spangled with heraldic fiction.'

No one who knows Mr Barron's work can doubt that we shall have those plain words, or will encounter with surprise in his pages 'obscure London tradesmen—drapers and oilmen outside the city gates.' Indeed one is tempted to believe that he must have discovered the oilman with a great and a peculiar joy.

'Mr Ardenne' (wrote Lord Beaconsfield in 'Lothair') 'had an ancient pedigree, and knew everybody else's, which was not always pleasant.' Lest his readers might miss the allusion to the late Mr Evelyn Shirley, the author was careful to add that 'what he most prided himself on was being the hereditary owner of a deer-park, the only one, he asserted, in the county.' Mr Barron reminds us in his preface of the chastening effect produced by the publication of Mr Shirley's book, 'The Noble and Gentle Men of England,' in the midst of a 'strange revel of genealogy,' when Norman and 'Saxon' houses were burgeoning forth before an unsuspecting public. One can but hope that such volumes as this may exercise a similar influence in view of the atrocious nonsense that finds its way into the Press as to families that are said to be still

seated on lands held by them not only since, but even from before the Conquest.

The principle, the distinctive principle, on which this work is based is that which Mr Shirley adopted, namely, that the qualification required for admission within its pale should be the association of a family with the tenure of a seat and landed estate for a certain period, in the male line. Mr Shirley's austere standard required that such a position should have been held continuously from a date well before the dissolution of the monasteries; Mr Barron opens his portals wider and requires evidence of such a position only from before the accession of George III. The whole remnant of an interesting and indeed historic class, our old territorial houses, will thus be marshalled before us; titles will make no difference; the 'Victoria History' looks only to the long association of a family with the county whose story it unfolds.

If only as a protest against the present practice of describing as 'landed gentry,' families destitute of landed estate, and allowing them to masquerade as such, in print, among the squires, one would welcome this honest enterprise. But its further limitation to those families which are not of yesterday confers an additional status on those whom it admits within its fold, and imparts to it the character of a *libro d' oro*, in which the appearance of a name will have a definite meaning and bestow the sense of privilege.

Algernon Sidney, speaking in his 'Discourses concerning Government' of certain commoners of ancient lineage, claimed that, 'if the tenure of their estates be considered, they have the same fame, and as antient as any of those who go under the name of duke or marquis.' And, when Mr Barron contends that what 'is called nobility on the continent of Europe has in our days been connected in England with the hereditary holding of free lands,' he is evidently unaware how ancient this conception is. In his 'Studies on Anglo-Saxon Institutions,' Mr Chadwick has recently reminded us what were 'the qualifications of thegnship' among our remote forefathers. For 'the rank of thegn,' he writes, 'the most usual condition is the possession of land'; and the ownership of at least 'five hides,' roughly the equivalent of the later 'manor,' was the standard. 'If he does not possess this

amount of land he is still to be accounted a ceorl, even though he has a helmet and a coat of mail and a sword overlaid with gold.' Again, of the 'Northleoda Lagu' we similarly read: 'Permanent nobility of blood was obtained after three generations, conditionally, however, on the possession of land during that period.' Here we have in essence the qualification required for the county-family volumes of the 'Victoria History,' though in detail the ownership of land must have covered a century and a half.

The student of English society in the past cannot fail to be struck by the eagerness to acquire a landed estate and the status which its ownership in time conferred. Less than thirty years ago the author of 'Our Old Nobility,' writing with the jaundiced bitterness in which the Welsh Radical excels, could still complain that

'The first step for a wealthy *parvenu* is to buy up land right and left. . . . Wealthy buyers have constantly been induced to accumulate land, no matter at what price purchased, as a road to the House of Lords. . . . We offer the highest prizes in the State to the men who will accumulate the most land in their own hands.'

The blind fury of the Radical against large landowners is that which Cobden did so much to foster—although they were notoriously far more liberal to those upon their land than the grasping millowner or sweating employer to those in their employ. But to Cobden, the champion of the men who ground the faces of the poor, fifty per cent. on one's capital was righteous, but two per cent. extortion. If we regard only the interests of the nation, the gratification of Radical spleen has been wholly injurious in its effects; it has meant the divorce of capital from the land, and the creation of a class the existence of which is a danger to the body-politic. In England the position of a landed proprietor has always entailed duties; it has given a man an interest in his district, and led him to reside largely on the land from which his importance was derived, and to spend his money in the district in which his seat was situate. But a social revolution has been taking place; and, now that the ownership of land has been dethroned from its position, which has been successfully usurped by the mere possession of wealth, a class has

arisen with no ties and no calls upon its purse, a class free to squander its fortunes at the pleasure-resorts of foreign lands or to rouse the anger of the people and goad them into socialist frenzy by combining, for the purpose of social advertisement, the luxury of the ancient world with the ostentation of the new.

Of this deplorable importation from the land of the Pilgrim Fathers the landed aristocracy are guiltless. Ground between the upper and the nether millstone of rising taxes and falling rents, too often driven from their fathers' homes or compelled to live in penury, they are still depicted as gorged with wealth, as the spoiled children of the State. Let us take a concrete instance. An election is near, and the usual attempt is made to inflame the populace by depicting the squire as extorting a 'dole' from the people. To suppress the facts that Sir William Harcourt imposed on him new and crushing taxes, and that the moneyed classes have shifted on to land the burden of local rates, is, of course, but economy of truth; the point is that the squire is cunningly shown in 'pink.' Now of all the changes of our time in country-life, none is more significant or notorious than that in the character of the hunting-field. On the one hand, the squires and the farmers have on all sides fallen from the ranks; on the other, their places have been filled by strangers who now hunt over their lands—by the brewer from the towns, or by the wealthy stockbroker; while the true attitude of the squire's assailants towards this costly sport is shown by the presence in the field of the socialist *grande dame* or of Radical members of Parliament, of American or Welsh extraction, who proudly proclaim in a work of reference that their recreation is 'hunting.'

Sharper even than the change in the hunting-field has been that in the representation of our counties since the Act of 1885 made the labourer its arbiter. To those who have practical experience of elections in the rural districts, and who know the tales the rustic is told, and in his simplicity believes, it is no surprise when his vote is given to the latest agitator from town, and when the character of county members, and with it that of the House of Commons, undergoes a revolution. Yet the lists of local members at the end of Mr Barron's volume prove that in Northamptonshire at least the change was slow. Even

at the revolutionary election of 1885 a Cecil, a Knightley, and a Spencer were returned. Only one of its four divisions was captured by a stranger.

A striking and characteristic feature of English political history is the long association of the House of Commons with our older county families. Of those that in Northamptonshire still survive, and are among the select band dealt with in this volume, a Wake is found as knight of the shire so far back as 1300, while a Knightley of Fawsley was sitting for the county in 1420, and another was familiar to the House in the same capacity from 1852 to 1892. The first of the great house of Spencer to represent the county in Parliament was Sir John, returned in 1554, and the latest was returned in 1900. The first Langham sat for Northamptonshire in 1656, and the first Isham in 1661, while in the house of Cartwright of Aynhoe, from 1695, 'the representation of Northamptonshire in Parliament,' to quote Mr Barron's words, 'became almost an hereditary honour' for a century and a half. Indeed, a Cartwright and an Isham kept it almost to themselves from 1701 to 1768. It was not till 1593 that a Cecil sat for the county, but the founder of the house was a burgess for Stamford so early as 1511; and the old order has not wholly changed when, even in the present year, we have seen Lord John Joicey-Cecil returned for the Stamford division.

As is well known to students of our parliamentary history, it is not till about the reign of Elizabeth that country gentlemen condescended to sit as burgesses for the local boroughs. In 1572 a Spencer is found as member for Northampton, and in 1584 a Knightley; and these names, with Langham and Isham, recur at later dates. For Peterborough an Isham of Pytchley was sitting so early as 1554, but it was not till the seventeenth century that the great house of Fane of Apethorpe is found representing it in Parliament. Of the nineteen families dealt with in this volume, we have shown that eight were representing Northamptonshire constituencies in Parliament before 1700; and to these may be added, in later times, Powys, Robinson, and Maunsell.

Of the great period of the English Parliament, the era of 'the Puritan Revolution,' as Mr Gardiner styled it, we have, for this county, interesting glimpses en-

twined with its genealogy. In the Puritan house of Knightley of Fawsley there were three Richards in succession. The first, who sat in four parliaments, left valuable notes, still preserved at Fawsley, of the proceedings in that of 1625. In 1639 this Richard was succeeded, not by his nearest heir-male—a point passed over by Mr Barron—but by a more distant cousin, who was, however, maternally his uncle. According to Mr Barron this second Richard was member for Northamptonshire in '16 Charles I'; but this is an error, for he sat for the county neither in the Short nor in the Long Parliament. Of the election for the former we have a vivid glimpse—priceless for the rarity of such touches—in the diary of a local Puritan, Robert Woodford. In those days county elections resembled manœuvres of horse. Gentry and freeholders rode to the field in troops, and formed up on the scene of action in two great companies with the rival candidates at their head. Northampton was on this occasion the scene, and Mr Elwes—whom we cannot identify in Mr Barron's pedigree of the family—the Court candidate; John Crewe of Stene, and Sir Gilbert Pickering of Tichmarsh—both of them in later days lords of Cromwell's making—stood for the country party. Peers could at that time take a part in elections that would have gladdened the heart of the late Mr James Lowther. Three Northamptonshire nobles, all Cavaliers as yet, were present on the field; and,

'after the writ was read, the Earl of Northampton, Earl of Westmoreland, Earl of Peterborough, with others, mounted their horses and rode between the companies, calling men to come to Mr Elwes his company; but the company of Mr Crew and Sir Gilbert, who stood near together, was the greatest, so the Lords would go to polling.'

It was agreed, in accordance with a practice of the time, that Mr Crewe should be returned; so Pickering and Elwes fought it out for the second seat, and two days later, 'about two or three o'clock, Sir Gilbert was declared knight of the shire to the joy of harts of gode people.'

The Puritans had triumphed (though the fact, we observe, is obscured by careless printing in the list of county members appended to this volume); and they triumphed again in the autumn of the year, when they

returned to the Long Parliament Sir Gilbert Pickering, with his brother-in-law, Sir John Dryden of Canons Ashby, still the home of his descendants. There is, we believe, preserved there his characteristic letter to his 'uncle,' Richard Knightley (the second)—who was only, in fact, it may be explained, his wife's mother's half-brother—written soon after Parliament met.

'He shall have his prayers, tho' he [Dryden] cannot be so serviceable either to him or the country that hath set him [Dryden] in that place of trust. He can only bring straw or stubble to that great work. God be praised, here want not skilful agents for this great work; it hitherto goeth on fast. . . . The walls go up fast, tho' they cannot be suddenly finished,' etc.

We take it that the uncle of 'glorious John' was speaking of that New Jerusalem which a reforming Parliament occasionally proposes to erect in this pleasant land.

As for Richard Knightley the third, he represented Northampton borough in both the Short and the Long Parliaments, and was chosen between the two to ride to the King at York with the grievances of his county in his pocket. A son-in-law of John Hampden, he was heart and soul for the cause; yet his political career was checkered. It is clear that he acted in conjunction with John Crewe, then member for Brackley. Together these ardent champions of the Parliament objected to the King's death; together they became in consequence, for awhile, the army's prisoners. Both of them made their peace with Cromwell; both sat in the Council of State on the eve of the King's restoration; and both, when that event took place, received their reward. Our conjecture is supported by the fact that, at this very time, there was issued Spelman's 'Historical Sacrilege,' dedicated to them jointly as 'worthy patriots of our county of Northampton.' Richard only lived long enough to enjoy his Knighthood of the Bath at the King's coronation (1661), although Mr Barron, by a luckless slip, marries him to his second wife in the days of James II.

Knightley, however, was not returned at the next election for the county, of which the record is preserved. In 1656 Northamptonshire had to return, not two, but six knights of the shire to Cromwell's second Parliament.

The blue-book containing the returns supplies but a single name, that of Claypole, his daughter's husband. We print, therefore, a striking narrative which supplies the names of all six.

'The freeholders, by the appointment of Major-General Butler, were assembled on Kettering Heath; and, the Sheriff having read the writ, the Major named himself and the five following gentlemen: Sir Gilbert Pickering, Mr Crew the younger, the Lord Cleypole, James Langham, Esq., and Major Blake. Having first named Sir Gilbert, he rode round the heath with a party of his own, crying "*a Pickering! a Pickering!*" and, coming to the Sheriff, ordered him to set him down as duly elected. The other five [*sic*] were successively returned in the same manner. At the same time Colonel Benson, with a large body of electors, was on the heath, and proposed, without any notice being taken of his nomination, Mr Knightley and other considerable gentlemen of the county.'

It is a singular fact that the last paragraphs of the last chapter of his work which the great historian of the Puritan Revolution was spared to finish dealt with the elections to this Parliament, and with the question of the influence which Cromwell's major-generals exercised upon them. We cannot doubt that had he known of this remarkable narrative he would have eagerly availed himself of its evidence, which would have modified, at least for this district, the conclusion at which he arrived.

We have been led to touch on the political aspect of the history of our landed aristocracy because it is one of considerable importance and is apt to be overlooked. Even Mr Barron—who presents in himself a combination perhaps unique, being unsurpassed as a genealogist and possessing a brilliant style—has failed, we think, to do full justice to all the interesting aspects of his theme. A genealogist *pur sang*, he is apt to forget that the mere accumulation of proofs, facts, and dates, although precisely what is needed by the peerage lawyer, is apt to make a weary maze for all but those who are as fascinated by the construction of a pedigree as himself. The publication of manuscript evidence in public and in private custody has proceeded so rapidly of late years that the writer of family history is now in a position to avail himself of a great mass of illustrative material formerly inaccessible, or at least difficult to obtain. We have

already made some use of it in speaking of Northamptonshire elections, and we propose to do so further in dealing with the family history in this volume.

To those who might expect to find Northamptonshire still rich in ancient houses, and even more to those whom novelists have taught to look on families seated on the lands they acquired at the Norman Conquest as of no unusual occurrence, it may come as a shock to learn that only nineteen of its families possess the modest qualification required for admission, and that of these only one can show a connexion with the county so far back even as the thirteenth century.

For the origin of our oldest houses we have in most cases to turn, not to that mythical Battle Roll which is still fondly believed to have been compiled at the Conquest, but to the return of knightly tenants which dates from just a century after William's landing. One Northamptonshire family, that of the Wakes, has a clear pedigree beyond it, and traces, moreover, not to a knightly, but to a baronial founder. Their true beginnings, hitherto obscured by one of those silly fictions over which Mr Freeman made merry, are here clearly established; and the father of Hugh Wac, the baron of Stephen's reign, is discovered in a Guernsey *seigneur*. Marrying heiresses in every generation, his descendants steadily rose in wealth and position till the death of the last Lord Wake of Liddell, in 1349, childless. The broad lands of Liddell had been brought to Hugh Wake of Bourne, in 1229, by his wife, Joan de Stuteville, who is here seen on her seal, her shield uplifted in her hand, and presenting by far the earliest instance of a lady riding side-saddle.

The Wakes of Courteenhall are but cadets of cadets, whom a happy chance has enabled to preserve their ancient name in the county which has known them since the marriage with a Briwere heiress brought Blisworth to their house in 1232. Ardent Royalists though they were, they weathered the Civil Wars; and a kindly fate has enabled them to escape the distressing name of Jones, which the sixth baronet was forced to adopt as the price of succeeding to Courteenhall. The varying fortunes of a fighting house are a fruitful theme for Mr Barron's pen; and their long pedigree enables him to show what modern genealogy can accomplish. A single instance

will illustrate the use that such work as this may possess for the student of historical documents. We have noted among Lord Salisbury's priceless MSS. at Hatfield a confidential letter to Archibald Douglas, in 1596, from 'a poor gentleman living in the country, very desirous to understand the state of the world,' who speaks of the bearer, Robert Wake, and himself as 'grandmother's children,' and writes from Bromham. The Record Office authorities read his name as 'J. Drue'; but it will doubtless occur to the expert that he was 'the righte woorshippfull John Dyve, Esquyer,' as his neighbours termed him, who was then head of the Bedfordshire house of Dyve of Bromham. Reference to Mr Barron's pedigree at once confirms the conjecture by showing us that Robert Wake of Hartwell had for his grandmother a Dyve of Bromham.

We turn to the Knightleys of Fawsley. Here we have one of those cases of which we have spoken above, in which a pedigree can be carried back—though not in this case perhaps with absolute certainty—to the returns of 1166. The family derived its name from Knightley in Staffordshire, their earliest lordship; and Fawsley did not become their seat till 'within a year of Agincourt field.' But the Knightleys grew to be a power in Northamptonshire, where Fawsley descended in turn to successive branches of their race, involving a tangle of pedigree that tests a genealogist to the utmost. Like the Tichbornes in Hampshire, they numbered among them ardent Puritans and stubborn recusants. As Mr Barron duly reminds us,

'in the autumn of 1588 "Martin Mar-Prelate" set up his travelling printing-press in a garret at Fawsley, where was printed the "Epitome" . . . followed by a broadside sheet of abuse aimed at the reverend bishops. Whilst this work was going forward in the garret, Master Penry, for the allaying of suspicion amongst curious malignants, walked in Fawsley Park clad as a gay gallant with a long sword, a hat of the fashion, and a broad, sky-coloured cloak with a collar of gold and silver and silk lace. It may be that the sour fanatic did not carry these Babylonish garments with a convincing swagger, for curious eyes pried into the garret. The press was borne away to Sir Richard's house at Norton and thence out of Northamptonshire; but it had left a trail of evidence; and Sir Richard Knightley made an unwilling appearance

before the Court of Star Chamber, and was only rescued from the clutches of that tribunal by the generous aid of Archbishop Whitgift, who had been a chief mark for Mar-Prelate's shot.'

Yet the recusant branch of the house, descended from Sir Richard's brother, produced but a century later in Alexander Knightley a Jacobite plotter, to whom we have detected a reference in a letter from Queen Mary (of Modena) among the Stuart papers at Windsor. To Sir John Knightley she writes that 'she will take it very kindly if he continues his good intentions of making his heir a gentleman of his name and family who serves in the regiment called hers, and for whom she has a particular good will and liking.' The coveted estate did not come to Alexander, for Sir John abandoned the Roman faith in 1688 and left him but 200*l*. Lying under sentence of death in Newgate in 1696, he lived to become (as we learn from the Stuart papers) a gentleman of the privy-chamber to the Old Pretender ten years later.

The Knightleys were among those English houses which 'left their dead about the world.' Two are said to have fallen at Tangier in a gallant sally on the Moors; Richard Knightley, whose end Mr Barron cannot tell us, died, we think, of the plague in Surinam (1668); his brother is said to have fallen in the wars in Flanders; while Valentine, of another branch, died at Masulipatam before the century had closed. Far different was the last resting-place of their forefather, Sir Richard Knightley, who died at the crisis of the eighth Henry's breach with Rome.

'Upon a noble tomb at Fawsley he and his wife Joan Skenard lie carven in alabaster—the knight in his plates, his head upon a crested helm, with a collar of essés about his neck. His tabard and the lady's long mantle are splendid with quarterings of arms, and in panels at the side of the tomb stand their children, amongst whom we see Edmund Knightley in his serjeant's robes.'

Of this 'splendid tomb . . . the most magnificent and beautiful of all the monuments of the house,' a singularly exquisite illustration adorns this stately volume.

Edmund Knightley married a Vere, the daughter of an Earl of Oxford; and, when he came to dwell in the seat

of his fathers, 'he is said to have finished the work upon the great hall at Fawsley, where his arms are in the window, supported by the blue boar of Vere and the golden falcon of the Skenards.' Lawyer that he was, he took a hand in the dissolving of religious houses, and made 'a Star-chamber matter' of it when his brother-in-law, Sir William Spencer, came upon him in Cheapside,

'in riotous manner, with six or seven persones with him, having their swordes and bucklers in their handes redi to fight . . . the said Sir William Spencer, laying his hande upon his dagger, and saying thies wordes: "Edmund Knightley, what communicacion hast thou had with the Busshopp of Lincoln concerning my vicious living?" . . . And therewith the said Sir William said to your said suppliant thies wordes: "Thou art a knave, a precious knave, and a wretche,"' etc.

The Spencers, as Mr Barron observes, were 'then rapidly become a ruling house on the country-side,' although their rise from the ranks of the great sheep-farmers of the Midlands had been but a recent business compared with the origin of the Knightleys.

Few, perhaps, are aware that, though the Spencers have now been seated for four centuries at Althorp, it is not there, but at Blenheim, that their heir-male is to be found. When Charles Spencer, the head of the house, who held the earldom of Sunderland and barony of Spencer, succeeded, through his mother, to the dukedom of Marlborough in 1733, he made over the Spencer estates to his younger brother, John, the ancestor of the Earls Spencer. His marriage with a Trevor the year before had so enraged their grandmother, old Duchess Sarah, that, writes Harbin to Lord Oxford, 'she has forbid Mr Spencer, upon her blessing, to come near his brother; but, finding he has no more duty for her than the earl (has), she has told him his doom.' That 'doom,' however, was averted by John Spencer, though the Duchess, 'the best hater of her time,' exacted from him a grievous sacrifice as the price of her favour. In 1744 he made, as Mr Barron tells us, a will, bequeathing to William Pitt the reversion of the Spencer estates. Why he made it we are not told; but we are admitted behind the scenes by a letter from that Lady Bolingbroke, *née* Des Champs de Marsilly, whose exquisite portrait by Nattier was sold not long ago at Christie's.

'Vous aurez sceu aussy que Mr Spenser a fait un testament que sa grande mère lavait obligé de faire out il laisse le bien de Sunderlan à Mr Pitt en cas de la mort de son fils. On avait dit quil avoit fait un codicil a Bathe pour changer ce testament, dont M. Sherterfield [Lord Chesterfield] est un des executeurs, mais come ce codicil na pas encore paru peustestre nen a til pas fait, et il le peut quun jour Mr Pitt se trouve avec 9 ou 10 mille livres de rente. Voila, ma chère contess, les jeux de la fortune et le comble de liniquité de cette vieille Malboroug, qui fait oster aux Spencers cadets le bien de leur famille, car quand à celui quelle avoit acumulé elle pouvoit sen croire la maîtresse. Le patriotisme est une belle chose quand il rend bien, car on le peu quitter ensuite quand on veut pour quelque autre recolte.'

Within a few months the tartar Duchess bequeathed to Pitt, by her own will, 10,000*l.* for 'the noble defence he had made for the support of the laws of England, and to prevent the ruin of his country,' and made her grandson the heir to the residue of her vast fortune, forbidding him to accept any office but that of ranger of Windsor Park. Less than two years later, Horace Walpole wrote:

'Jack Spencer, old Marlborough's grandson and heir, is dead at the age of six or seven and thirty, and in possession of near 30,000*l.* a year, merely because he would not be abridged of those invaluable blessings of an English subject—brandy, small beer, and tobacco.'

A portrait of him shooting over dogs, with his boy by his side, is reproduced in the volume.

As the earlier Spencer history is to appear under 'Oxfordshire,' on the ground that Blenheim is the seat of their present head, and as the Ellesme Egertons are to be treated of, not under 'Northamptonshire'—where Brackley gives name to their viscountcy, and was formerly their pocket-borough—but under 'Lancashire,' which contains their 'principal seat,' it would *a fortiori* be expected that Lord Northampton's family would be dealt with in this volume in virtue of their tenure of Castle Ashby, which has long been their chief seat. Inconsistently, however, as it seems to us, they are to be treated as a Warwickshire family because their older home, from which they derive their name, is found at Compton Wynyates. Northamptonshire thus loses the tale of a noble house which has

long played a part in its history. The eighth earl, we believe, was one of its three magnates who did their best to wreck their fortunes over one of those eighteenth century elections which left their scars on our landed houses; nor did he ever recover from its effects. 'The Northampton election,' wrote George Selwyn, 'will cost God knows what.' In contrast with the Comptons, the house of Fitzwilliam will be dealt with, not under Milton, which still gives them their courtesy title and has been theirs for more than four centuries, but under Wentworth House, in Yorkshire, that vast mansion which they did not inherit till 1782. This obscures the interesting fact that, in spite of its long pedigree, the family was founded, as it were, anew by Alderman Fitzwilliam, who purchased Milton and other estates with the wealth he had acquired in the City. As with Althorp, it has now become, though only for half a century, the seat of a cadet branch.

'For those,' writes Mr Barron, 'who would study the sociology of our great landed houses, it may be of interest to point to the large part played in Northamptonshire, as elsewhere, by the practice of the law, that maker of English nobility and begetter of ancestral fortunes.' We think that he is disposed to exaggerate the proportion of territorial families founded by successful lawyers, although the belief that it was large is of old standing. The acquisition of the Milton estate reminds us how large a part London aldermen and merchants have played in the foundation, if not of families, at least of their wealth and possessions. Even the one essentially feudal house in the county, the Wakes of Courteenhall, owe their seat and estate to their descent from a London merchant, Isaac Jones. But the cases of Isham, Robinson, and Langham are more directly to the point; and with these three families of baronets we now proceed to deal.

The Ishams, who derived their name from the parish of that name in the county, first meet us, about the end of the fourteenth century, at Pytchley, its neighbour; but we agree with Mr Barron in thinking it probable that they descended from the old lords of Isham, in which case their connexion with Northamptonshire would be older than that of any family in the volume. Yet Lamport, the present seat of the house, was acquired by John Isham, who, like his brothers Gregory and Henry, became a

citizen and mercer of London in the days of the sixth Edward. In many ways of singular interest, the Ishams are probably better known for their ancestral raiment at South Kensington than for the interesting library at Lamport, or for those curious chronicles which led Mr Walter Rye to say that, in all probability, 'no family in England has more ample and minute materials for its history.' That even the vicissitudes of the English Church may at times have light thrown on them by the study of genealogy is shown by the case of Robert Isham, a brother of the three London merchants and a chaplain to Queen Mary. On the accession of Queen Elizabeth he lost his stall as a canon of Peterborough, but contrived, we find, to retain the family living of Pytchley, dying a well-to-do parson thereof in 1564.

A genuine connexion with New England is always interesting to trace; and one welcomes, therefore, Mr Barron's proof that Henry Isham, a great-grandson of Gregory, 'left England for Virginia, and through his daughters . . . his blood runs in the veins of many of the old families of the south.' But Americans will detect another connexion, to which he does not allude. The curious Christian name of Justinian, borne by six of the Lamport baronets, owes its existence to a learned civilian of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, whose professional enthusiasm for the author of the Digest must have led him to bestow upon his son the emperor's name. One of this learned man's daughters and co-heiresses married the first baronet of Lamport, and another bore a famous name as the wife of Lawrence Washington.

Mr Barron also seems to have omitted Henry Isham, a younger son of Thomas Isham of Pytchley, who found himself at Algiers, under the emperor's banner, in the days of Henry VIII, and, marrying a Kentish heiress, obtained with her the captaincy of Walmer Castle. Among Lord Burghley's papers is preserved a mysterious letter to their son Edward in 1589, inviting him, as captain of the castle, to betray his trust, 'not doubting of your well-disposed mind towards our Catholic religion, whose predecessors have always been of that ancient Church and faith, as you know,' and hinting that he only conformed 'for policy's sake.' It is significant that we find him a prisoner in the Tower not long afterwards.

Both the Langhams and the Robinsons received their baronetcies in June 1660, the grantees and founders of their respective families being City aldermen. But, although they both assisted the Restoration, Langham belonged, in our opinion, to that middle or Presbyterian party which was so powerful in London, while Sir John Robinson was that *rara avis*, a City Royalist and Anglican. It is a curious illustration of the difference in values in the last two and a half centuries, that at the Restoration baronetcies could be purchased for as little as 400*l.*; though a great merchant like Sir John Langham, whose fine, dignified face looks out at us here squarely above the broad Puritan collar, could clear, it was said, at one stroke 30,000*l.* by cornering the year's currant crop. Another Langham, a London apothecary, purchased the Northamptonshire estate of Arthingworth, still held by his heirs the Rokebys. Mr Barron, we think, is sometimes apt to be so absorbed in his genealogy as to overlook the close connexion between a family's pedigree and its estates. He duly records the interesting fact that the Langhams have impressed their name on a London district through the rise of the 'Langham' hotel on the site of one of their town houses; but he ignores the remarkable succession of Sir James Hay Langham, in 1824, to the Sussex estate of Glyndebourne, at the foot of the Lewes Downs, the home of William Hay, poet, politician, and philosopher, in virtue of his ancestor's marriage with Martha, daughter of Herbert Hay, so far back as 1666. On his succeeding to Cottesbrooke, the seat of his house since 1639, Glyndebourne passed to the Langham Christies; but the old alliance is commemorated in the name of the twelfth baronet, Sir Herbert Hay Langham.

The most striking fact perhaps in the Robinson pedigree is that which is similarly commemorated in the name of the present baronet, the fact that the mother of the founder of their house was a half-sister of Archbishop Laud, that unhappy man of whom we have heard Professor Gardiner say, with deep insight, that but for him there would probably have been no Civil War. The genealogist here brings to light that prelate's amazing nepotism, a feature in his character perhaps hitherto unsuspected. Mr Barron, however, has confused, we

think, his pluralist nephew, Dr Cottesford, with his father. He appears also to be unaware of the very interesting glimpse of Sir John Robinson to be found in the autobiography of Sir John Bramston. Bramston and his father, who were strong churchmen, had, under the Commonwealth, sought in vain for a minister to their taste in the City, till, entering the now vanished church of St Mary Magdalen, Milk Street, he found to his surprise that Robinson, its churchwarden, had installed there 'Mr Farrington, that excellent scholar and orthodox preacher,' the ejected vicar of Bray. Here, again, we have a sidelight on the history of the English Church. Bramston adds that he knew Robinson as having been apprenticed before the war to Mr Marsham (of Lord Romney's family), who had gone to join the King, and in whose house he was living. It is more to Mr Barron's taste that Pepys, after drinking with Sir John, described him as a 'bragging bufflehead,' though he was 'mightily pleased' with his wife, a 'comely, big woman.'

We have been led to speak of the great part played by City aldermen in the founding of landed houses; but far different was the origin of the three families in this volume who have attained the higher honours in the peerage—those of Fane, Earls of Westmorland, Cecil, Marquises of Exeter, and FitzRoy, Dukes of Grafton. As the elder, though the less known line of the Cecils, the lords of Burghley are traced by Mr Barron to their beginning, a beginning which, since the time of the great Burghley himself, has vexed the souls of genealogists. His conclusions are directly opposed to those of a recent work on the subject, for he definitely adopts the theory of Welsh origin. To those who know that, as a Christian name, Seisil had been not infrequent in Wales, it will seem probable enough that Altt yr Ynys on the Welsh March was the cradle of the famous house. But, before the days of Burghley's grandfather, old David Cecil, the pedigree was quite conjectural. Mr Barron does not touch on the curious Cecil crest, and its alleged derivation from the Winstons, remote ancestors of the house; nor does he mention the heraldry with which the founder of Burghley adorned the vaulting of its western entrance in 1585-7. But the statesman who had gained wealth and

fame hungered for ancestral coats; and those were the great days, not of heraldry, but of heralds. 'Davye Sessell' was a yeoman of the guard, we learn, under Henry VII, and, as such, received at Henry's funeral (1509) a livery of black cloth. But he and his offspring rose steadily in the sunshine of royal favour; and, when two earldoms were bestowed upon his house less than a century later (1605, 1606), they bore the stately and historic styles of Salisbury and Exeter. We may add that a letter preserved at Belvoir dates the marriage to which it refers more closely than is here done, when, on December 3, 1610, the writer states it as 'most sure that the Erle of Exeter is newly married to the young fayre Lady Smythe, the widow of Sir Thomas Smythe.'

If the origin of the Cecils was a thorny question, that of the Fanes (and Vanes) gave Mr Barron his chance. Those who have visited Battle Abbey may have noticed in the windows of its banqueting-hall armorial coats depicting the descent of a former owner, the Duke of Cleveland. Had not the Vanes, of whom he came, a 'pedigree, as set forth and prepared by the heralds of the realm,' from Howel ap Vane, a Welsh noble of days before the Conquest? Were there not, in Mr Barron's words, 'rolls of ancestry beautiful with illuminated shields and attested by the signatures of officers of arms?' Nay, when one of the Fane family set himself, some years ago, 'to test the authenticity of the Fane pedigree as given in the "Heralds' Visitations of Kent," preserved at the College of Arms, by the light of contemporary records,' and found it 'constantly incorrect,' was not an assistant of York herald (now Garter King-at-arms) shocked at any one rashly daring to question 'the genuineness of the pedigree registered by a herald acting under royal commission'? But the day for such language has passed away; and the pedigree which converted a yeoman of Kent into a Welsh gentleman of ancient lineage has but short shrift at Mr Barron's hands. The Fanes have a goodly origin.

'A knight of Cales,
A gentleman of Wales,
And a laird of the north countree,
A yeoman of Kent,
With his yearly rent,
Can buy them up all three.'

Who now remembers 'the Greycoats of Kent'? Yet they were still a power in the land when George the First was king, as the Kentish squires knew to their cost, for the yeoman vote turned the scale at a poll for knights of the shire. 'These were they that in times past made all France afraid.'

So we start with Henry a Vane, chamberlain at Tonbridge to the Earl of Stafford in 1437. In Mr Barron's words:

'This yeoman of Kent, of humble place, and with no known ancestry at his back, was an ancestor indeed, the founder of a family which saved, and fought, and married its way to the first rank in England. From the loins of Harry Vane came Fanes, Earls of Westmorland, Lords Le Despenser and Burghersh; Vanes, Dukes of Cleveland . . . Viscounts Fane of Loughgur and Viscounts Vane; Vanes and Fanes, baronets and knights of the Garter and the Bath; Vanes and Fanes, Puritans and Cavaliers, soldiers and sailors, diplomatists and conspirators, dramatists and divines.'

Yet Henry's eldest son, John, is always styled a yeoman; nor was it till the day when it rained pedigrees that Cooke, Clarenceux, bestowed on him a fitting ancestral rank.

In Mr Barron's spirited sketch of the family history no allusion is made to the Jacobite tendencies of the house. The memoirs of the sixth Earl indeed lay stress on his father's support of the 'Glorious Revolution,' and on the favour that he and his brother had expected, and to some extent received, from King William in consequence. But then his mother was a City heiress, a Rachel, the daughter of a Judith, names which suggest the character of the views she must have held, and apparently impressed upon her husband, whose gross, jolly face looks out bluffly from the canvas, between his wig and his cravat. Far different had been the marriage, the second marriage, of the third Earl, the writer's uncle. His wife was a Brudenell of Deane, of a great Northamptonshire house, whose father and grandfather, Earls of Cardigan, were Cavaliers heart and soul, and recusants to boot. When Charles was planning his escape from Carisbrooke Castle, it was her father who had supplied the money for the attempt; and to her grandfather he had written from within his prison walls.

'BRUDNELL,—Your doing that Courtoisie for me w^h this Noble Lady will tell you of, who will deliver you this, I doe heerby promis you, as soone as I have a greate Seale in my owen Power, to confer upon you the Tyle & Honnor of an Earle of this Kingdome; wherefor I hope you will take & trust to this my word; presently performing that w^{ch} I am made belive you will doe for me: So I rest your most asseured Frend.'

It was she herself (not, as might be thought, the wife of the sixth Earl) of whom the Old Pretender wrote to Bolingbroke, August 23, 1715:

'Some months ago Lady Westmorland writt the good dispositions her nephew (the Duke of Shrewsbury) was in, and on that I writt a letter to that Lady to be shewd to him, but the whole was only in general terms. . . . This particular of Lady Westm[orland] is only to your self and Charles, because I believe that Lady would be very cautious of the secret of what her nephew may have said to her.'

Shrewsbury was a son of her infamous sister the 'wanton Shrewsbury' of Pope.

Whether the old Countess infected with the Jacobite leaven her husband's nephew the seventh Earl, or not, it was partly for his Jacobite sympathies that Oxford made him its Chancellor at the close of George the Second's reign; and the Young Pretender himself alleged that when he visited London in 1750, Lord Westmorland was among the friends who assembled secretly in Pall Mall to meet him. It is only fair to Mr Barron to say that not even the 'Dictionary of National Biography' knows anything of this episode in the Earl's career.

The FitzRoys, Dukes of Grafton, are dealt with in this volume because the honour of Grafton, from which their title is derived, was part of the immense provision made by Charles for their founder, one of his sons by Duchess Barbara the notorious, of whom Dugdale brought himself to write that, 'as in former times the raising of eminent women to great titles of honour hath not been unusual in this realm, in pursuance, therefore, of those so laudable examples,' this 'Barbara, by reason of her noble descent from divers worthy ancestors, and her father's death in his Majesties army, as also in respect of her own personal vertues,' was created Duchess of Cleveland!

But the chief seat of the house is at Euston, 'on the decoys and orange-gardens and interminable conservatories' of which Lord Arlington, in Macaulay's words, 'lavished his ill-gotten wealth,' and which came with his child-heiress to the first Duke of Grafton. To the pageant of his soldier's life, as it glitters in Mr Barron's hands, we are tempted to add a quaint touch from a letter of John Methuen, who wrote from Lisbon that 'the convents are kept stricter in consequence, it is said, of the Duke of Grafton and some companions. The nuns can only be seen through two gratings, nine feet apart, which they opposed by law-suits and violence.'

Of Northamptonshire houses which undoubtedly rose and acquired estates by the practice of the law, those of Cartwright of Aynhoe, Powys, Lord Lilford, and Willes of Astrop are the best examples. The Cartwrights, whose family portraits supply some fine illustrations, were founded by a barrister who purchased Aynhoe in 1615, having, though of undistinguished birth, acquired a great fortune, as is shown by his son's wealth. The Maunsell who purchased Thorpe Malsor in 1622 was also at the Bar, as were his father and brother; but the family had been landowners previously for many generations in Bucks. The Palmers of Carlton, who have been seated there for nearly five centuries—the longest continuous tenure in the male line in the county—produced an attorney-general under Charles II; but Carlton came to them by marriage. It is probable, no doubt, that the purchase of Brockhall, in 1625, by a Thornton was the fruit of his labours at the Bar; but we think that in Northamptonshire the proportion of families so founded is above the average.

The other families specially dealt with are Dryden of Canons Ashby, Rokeby of Arthingworth (of old north-country stock), Young of Orlingbury (of Worcestershire origin), and Cary-Elwes of Great Billing, the last-named of which did not settle in the county till the end of the eighteenth century.

We are given, under Dryden of Canons Ashby, an exceptionally full account of the family of Page-Turner, to which they belong by male descent, and an interesting portrait of Sir Gregory Page-Turner, who added the name and arms of Page to those of Turner on succeeding to Sir Gregory Page's estate. But there is no description of

the splendid seat which came to him with that inheritance. Sir Gregory, the son (we have seen it stated) of a Greenwich brewer, was like his son-in-law, Sir Edward Turner, an East India director, a new-made baronet, and a man of vast wealth. Buying Wricklesmarsh, the grounds of which extended from Blackheath right to the Eltham Road, in 1721, he set himself at once to build what, in Defoe's words, 'will be a more magnificent work than any private gentleman's seat in this part of Great Britain.' In eleven months the pile was raised; and the 'palace' was quickly filled by its owner with what our forefathers deemed the masterpieces of art. When Arthur Young visited the house in 1767, his bucolic soul revelled in the grossness of the early Georgian taste. The City magnate had filled his dressing-room with pictures such as greeted Christopher Sly when he opened his eyes in the lord's chamber; and the agriculturist found them 'worthy of a month's incessant admiration,' and 'the females capitally plump.' Collectors should note that he also observed 'a beautiful collection of ornamental Dresden and Chelsea porcellane (*sic*) scattered about the house.' The end of Wricklesmarsh and its glories came quickly enough; in 1782 the Page-Turners parted with that 'very magnificent structure'; and three years later it was sold for building materials and the stately grounds broken up.

Blenheim was but one of the 'heavy loads' that Vanbrugh and his fellows laid upon the earth; noble and *nouveau riche* were building on a mighty scale. 'The house,' wrote Horace Walpole of Sir Gregory's mansion, 'is magnificent, but wounded me; it was built on the model of Houghton.' At Wanstead in Essex, there had risen, shortly before, that 'magnificent palace' on which was lavished the wealth acquired in the City by the Childs, and which—the wonder of London, and one of the sights of England—became, early in the last century, the victim of profligate extravagance. Levelled, like Wricklesmarsh, to the ground, its existence is now but a tradition, and its site a people's park.

The vast wealth of the Turners was acquired by them as City merchants; and the Elwes' fortune was founded by a City alderman in the days of James I. The attitude of the landed aristocracy to trade, and the history of class distinctions, is far too wide and difficult a question to

discuss in the space remaining to us. But there was clearly a great change between the beginning and the end of the eighteenth century, several causes uniting to widen the gulf between the gentleman and the shopkeeper, and to make the practice of apprenticing cadets not only obsolete, but as completely forgotten as if it had never existed. Lecky, writing on this century, observed that 'it was noticed, as a remarkable sign of the democratic spirit that followed the Commonwealth, that country gentlemen in England had begun to bind their sons as apprentices to merchants'—for which he cites the old authority of Hume, and quotes from Pope's 'Moral Essays':

'Boastful and rough, your first son is a squire,
The next a tradesman meek, and much a liar.'

But there were apprentices and apprentices; and, although the statement quoted by Lecky from a pamphlet of 1722—that 'now the greatest gentlemen affect to make their junior sons Turkey merchants'—is supported by letters (which we have seen) so early as 1683, relating to a son of Lord Castleton, a nephew of Lord Fauconberg, Pope's tradesman, the shopkeeping cadet whom the 'Tatler' describes in 1709 is on quite another footing. Hume, moreover, we find, only cited Clarendon; nor have we been able to verify the quotation. But there has lately come to light a very curious paper, written by a peer's brother in 1657, which bears directly on the question. The author complains that

'nothing argues the ill-breeding of our gentlemen so much as the low employments they betake themselves to as not knowing themselves fitt for higher ones. To be apprentices in a shop, sitt barehead, sweep the shop and streets, is the life of thousands. To serve noblemen in most unnoble offices . . . is the ordinary course of gentlemen in England, wilst in other countreys they goe to the warres and scorne to sitt in a shop or wate upon any one.'

In Gascony at least, that home of an ancient landed aristocracy, the cadet, as M. Rostand reminds us, looked for his living to his sword.

So far as we have been able to judge from this Northamptonshire volume, the younger sons who were sent to

make their fortunes in London were rather those of the smaller gentry, or of men who were themselves cadets, than those of substantial squires. And this accords with what Sir Robert Naunton says in his 'Fragmenta Regalia' when, speaking of the Tudor period, he tells us of one who was 'exposed and sent to the citie, as poor gentlemen use to do their sons, and became a rich man on London Bridge.' Those who remember the feelings of Sir Roger de Coverley on the subject, or who have met, in the 'Spectator,' with that 'old country gentleman' whose heart went pit-a-pat when he discovered 'an alderman of London' in his pedigree, and who wished to cut off the 'merchant-taylor perched on a bough' thereof, know that the contempt for trade felt by the country gentry is far older and more deeply-rooted than Mr Barron imagines. Throughout our history the higgling of the market was held to leave its traces even to the third generation, to exert an influence that could only be purged by a prolonged tenure of landed estate. We observed at the outset that this was the case even so far back as a thousand years ago; and the maxim that 'it takes three generations to make a gentleman' is, as has been seen, as old as the Anglo-Saxon laws. We find Habington, the Worcestershire chronicler, writing of Sir William Courteen—whose daughter married a Knightley of Fawsley—that 'this knight was so famed for his modesty, bounty, and charity to his tenants and neighbours as is scarce to be met with in those new men who purchase gentlemen out of their ancient habitations and manors.' And we heard but the other day the same contrast drawn by a leading tenant-farmer, at a coming-of-age celebration, between the *novi homines* and the squires of old estates.

And now we must take our leave of Northamptonshire halls and manors with a parting glimpse of the county in days when it teemed with gentry. An aroma as of 'Sandford and Merton' hangs about this quaint page from the travels of the Rev. James Brome in the year 1700.

'Nor is there perhaps a county which, within that compass of ground, can show more Noblemen and Gentlemen's seats; for in all the dispersed villages of this country it is observed that there are fixed several bright and coruscant Luminaries shining in this Orb, of whose influence the Peasantry are continually sensible, feeling divers good Effects and enlivening

Operations from their Vicinity. For whilst the Noblemen and Persons of Superior Ranks transplant themselves hither, and fix in this Soil, the Commonalty are quickly invigorated with the warmth which they communicate, whilst all Trades flourish more by those Encouragements they afford them.'

It is a picture that would have charmed Sir Leicester Deadlock, or rather the kindly English gentleman of whom he was the caricature.

On Mr Barron's volume we may congratulate those responsible for its production. Of noble *format* and splendidly printed, its fine portraits and artistic heraldry add no less to its attractiveness than his masterly genealogy to its value. When we turn from such a work to Burke's 'Landed Gentry,' the contrast is sharp indeed. Mr Barron avowedly sets himself to distinguish the old from the newer landed families by adopting a uniform method free from fear or favour; 'Burke,' it is hardly too much to say, devotes itself, on the contrary, to confusing the newer with the older families by narratives which at least suggest, for the former, pedigrees and a landed status remote from actual fact. We do not of course imply that the pedigrees are mere fiction; but the expert can detect generations of humble and obscure individuals where the general reader would only see pedigrees resembling those of an ancient house of squires. 'Jeames de la Pluche' may marry the cook (we have in mind an actual case), but he and his parents might be people of position, if we were to judge from 'Burke.' Where this method cannot be employed, it is always possible to invoke 'tradition.' A family, for instance, which begins its pedigree no earlier than the middle of the eighteenth century, 'claims descent by tradition from a race of independent Kentish yeomen of Saxon times.'

The complaint is sometimes made, and we think justly made, that the really old families in 'Burke' are quite eclipsed by the splendour of those which have lately risen. Less than a generation ago the pedigree of Smith-Carington would here have been vainly sought for. It now fills no less than a page and three-quarters, and is one of the most gorgeous in the volume, conveying the idea of a house with a great position from the Conquest. But its growth has been as rapid as the mushroom's, or perhaps we should say that it has risen from very small

seeds. But after all, our chief complaint against the 'Landed Gentry' is not that its genealogy is misleading, but that it is going from bad to worse as a record of the 'landed' gentry. The class with whom the work professes to deal is thus set forth in an edition published since the death of Sir Bernard Burke:

'Invested with no hereditary titles, but inheriting landed estates, transmitted from generation to generation, in some instances from the periods of the Conquest and the Plantagenets, this class has held, and continues to hold, the foremost place in each county. The tenure of land was, in the olden time, the test of rank and position . . . and even now it remains the same. . . . No pains have been spared in the preparation of this edition. . . . Every available source of information has been exhausted. Each memoir has been carefully revised.'

We turn over these pages, and what do we find? In one home-county a gentleman from the Stock Exchange purchased a house (not a seat) with some thirty acres, and forthwith appeared among the 'landed' gentry with a pedigree of nearly two pages, while such houses as Okeover of Okeover and Scrope of Danby have less than one apiece. In another a landless paper-manufacturer rented a small residence and garden, which enshrined him among what 'Burke' considers the landed gentry; in yet another a country banker, who owned no land, rented in succession two houses, one of them in a town, which 'Burke' entered as his 'seats.' One of them still so figures, though it has another tenant. In Middlesex a family is entered as 'of Hadleigh House,' which proves to be in Highbury New Park, a curious qualification for a landed gentleman. It is needless to extend such a list as this; 'every available source of information' does not, it would seem, include even Kelly's Directories or the return of owners of land. We are told in the latest edition that 'the sale of their estates' excludes families from these pages, yet so carelessly is the work compiled that 'Bullock of Faulkbourne' appears on one page, and 'Parker of Faulkbourne' on another, each family being credited with Faulkbourne Hall as its seat. Since the Bullocks, described as 'now of Faulkbourne,' sold the estate, it has changed hands, we believe, more than once; but some amends is

made to its actual possessors by assigning them a second seat of which they were never the owners. Such is the work of which (to continue our quotation) 'it is confidently hoped' that 'it will be found a reliable authority on the subject of which it treats, and an adequate and faithful record of an influential class.'

If we feel it our duty to speak strongly of its genealogical history, it is because this eleventh and latest edition vaunts, in the usual fashion, 'the very careful revision necessitated by the more precise and critical methods of modern research,' and even glibly speaks of 'the constant increase in our genealogical knowledge.' With great regret we have to say that we find the editors, on the contrary, repeating fables and blunders, even when publicly exposed. The audacity of certain statements is almost past belief. Thus of the Sibthorps we read that,

'in Domesday Book, folio, vol. i, p. 287, are enrolled the names of Robertus de Sibetorp and Willielmus de Sibetorp.'

This statement is simply untrue. The actual words in 'Domesday' are only 'Robertus homo Willelmi,' that is, Robert, a tenant of William (Peverel)! So also, under Bulwer of Heydon (whence Bulwer Lytton), we read that

'the family of Bulwer, of Norman origin, was founded by Tyrus or Turoid de Palling, who was enfeoffed of the lordships of Wood Dalling and Bynham by Peter de Valoins.'

A glance at 'Domesday' is sufficient to show that Peter had enfeoffed no such person at either of these places. 'Tyrus' and 'Turoid' are all the same, doubtless, to the editors of 'Burke'; for, under 'Scudamore,' we still find, in the twelfth century, 'Sir Titus' followed by 'Sir Willcock,' a pedigree one could only expect to find in the pages of 'Punch.' The Beckwiths, we learn, 'originally bore the name of Malebie or Malebisse,' but on marrying, about 1226, a certain 'Dame Beckwith'—who was not, strange to say, the widow of a City knight, but a daughter of Sir William Bruce—agreed to take the name that she so unaccountably bore. Let us hope that they duly registered the change in the College of Arms.

As an example of 'the more precise and critical methods of modern research,' the pedigree of a member of that College is still deduced from 'Sir Reginald de

Lone,' living at a remote period, although it has long been shown that the family derived its name from living 'in the lane' at Wolverhampton at a date considerably later. We may close with an illustration of the 'increase of our genealogical knowledge.' The pedigree of Grimston of Grimston Garth (a genuinely ancient house) formerly began in the days of Stephen; in this edition we find it thus carried to the Conquest:

'Sylvester de Grymestone is recorded by Philpot (*sic*) to have been standard-bearer at Hastings. He did homage for his lands at Grimston and elsewhere in 1067, in which year he was chamberlain to William I.'

The whole paragraph is sheer fiction, and obvious fiction to boot; for Yorkshire had not even been conquered in 1067. Another addition to our knowledge since some earlier edition is found in the extension of the Daubeney pedigree to the days of the Norman Conquest. In it we find the delightful phrase that the family is 'represented on the Rolls of Battle Abbey and of Magna Charta.' Such a phrase would have roused Freeman to peals of Homeric laughter. It is when we find the Battle Roll, 'Philpot,' or the 'records' of the Heralds' College vouched for the period of the Conquest, that we understand why genealogy in England had become the laughing-stock of scholars. For those who are labouring to rescue it from this deplorable position we here raise our voice; we ask that they should receive the encouragement due to those who are fighting a hard battle in the cause of honesty and of truth.

Art. XII.—THE REAL NEEDS OF IRELAND.

1. *Ireland in the New Century*. Third edition. By Sir Horace Plunkett. London: Murray, 1905.
2. *The Crisis in Ireland*. By the Earl of Dunraven. London: Chapman and Hall, 1905.
3. *Irish History and the Irish Question*. By Goldwin Smith. Toronto: Morang; London: Jack, 1905.
4. *Devolution in the British Empire*. By the Earl of Dunraven. London: Chapman and Hall, 1906.
5. *Speeches on Devolution*. By the Right Hon. Lord Atkinson. Dublin: The Irish Unionist Alliance.
6. *Modern Ireland and her Agrarian Problem*. By Moritz J. Bonn, Ph.D. London: Murray; Dublin: Hodges and Figgis, 1906.
7. *Report of the Estates Commissioners for Ireland*. Dublin: Ponsonby, 1906.

RECENT events and controversies threaten to plunge Ireland once more into the cauldron of party politics. We regret this deeply, but feel that it furnishes all the more reason for a thoughtful outlook upon Irish affairs. In his much-criticised book on Ireland, Sir Horace Plunkett has described the Irish question as 'a many-sided, deeply-rooted human problem which has baffled generation after generation of a great and virile race, who complacently attribute their incapacity to master it to Irish perversity, and pass on, leaving it unsolved by Anglo-Saxons, and therefore insoluble!' We hope it is not insoluble, even by the Anglo-Saxon; but the problem, as Sir Horace well says, is a human one, many-sided and deeply-rooted; and we feel, for this reason, all the more averse from seeing it made a pawn in any partisan contentions. We agree with Sir Horace Plunkett in thinking the Irish question to be now mainly a question of character, and in believing the economic aspect of the question to be gravely important.

Holding these views, we cannot observe without uneasiness so many signs that the old political passions and contentions are about to surge forth anew, interrupting the quiet progress of economic development which has been going on in Ireland since 1895, the year in which Mr Gerald Balfour took office as Chief Secretary. Regret

this as we may, we nevertheless feel that we cannot ignore present political issues; but, having given those issues their right share of notice, we shall turn towards the more hopeful means whereby the Anglo-Saxon may endeavour to solve the riddle of what Mr Morley once called the Irish sphinx.

The political interest most prominent in many minds just now is the Devolution policy, and the question whether it is to be the basis of the Government's Irish Bill of next year. At the recent general election, Ministers did not very explicitly tell the country what their Irish policy was to be. The Prime Minister's Stirling speech seemed, as Lord Rosebery said, to lift the banner of Home Rule once more. Yet in that speech Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman did not actually mention Home Rule as a policy, though he undoubtedly described a policy which, in its full realisation, would be as much equivalent to Home Rule as twenty shillings are equivalent to a sovereign. He said his desire was 'to see the effective management of Irish affairs in the hands of a representative Irish authority'; and he advised every Nationalist to 'take it in any way he could get it.' Perhaps the following sentence contains the most striking pronouncement of Sir Henry's views on the whole question.

'If an instalment of representative control were offered to Ireland, or any administrative improvement, he would advise the Nationalists thankfully to accept it, provided it was consistent and led up to their larger policy; but, he repeated, it must be consistent with, and lead up to, the larger policy. To secure good administration was one thing, but good government could never be a substitute for government by the people themselves.' ('Times,' November 24, 1905.)

From this we gather that good administration is merely a part of the larger policy, 'government by the people themselves' being evidently the real thing, such government being vested of course in the 'representative Irish authority.' The most remarkable part of this declaration is that everything must be consistent with and lead up to 'the larger policy.' If this does not make Home Rule the final objective, then it cannot mean anything.

On November 27 Sir Edward Grey, speaking at New-

castle-under-Lyme, said 'he thought it was for Liberals to carry on the policy of Mr Wyndham and Sir Antony MacDonnell where the present Government had left off.' Sir Edward also said 'he considered that everybody ought to know that whoever voted for the Liberal party ought to be prepared to see the Liberal Government go on with Sir Antony MacDonnell's policy. Further than that he did not think it would be right to take them.' Speaking on the following day at Wisbech, Mr Asquith 'associated himself entirely and unreservedly with every word that was spoken on Monday night by his friend Sir Edward Grey.' Mr Asquith repeated the phrase 'step by step' in connexion with a policy of endeavouring 'more and more to associate Irish ideas and the Irish people themselves with the management of purely Irish affairs.' Mr Birrell, at Birmingham (Nov. 29), spoke of 'the devolution of local business upon local assemblies,' meaning, evidently, what is called Home Rule all round. Mr Haldane, in a speech at Salisbury (Dec. 1), said, 'There lay to hand a very plain policy.' He then mentioned Sir Antony MacDonnell, and added, 'Let them give him a chance.'

Perhaps this selection of Ministerial declarations will be sufficiently representative of the leanings of that part of the Cabinet which we have most to consider. If we survey them with one glance, the things that stand out are the Premier's declaration that everything 'must lead up to the larger policy,' and the Grey-Asquith-Haldane pronouncements in favour of Sir Antony MacDonnell's policy. The link between the Premier and the Liberal Imperialists is that the former used the word 'instalment,' and Sir Edward Grey and Mr Asquith said 'step by step.' The various pronouncements are apparently consistent with the harmonious co-operation of their makers during the present Parliament. As even Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman himself does not want Home Rule immediately, it seems to us that the 'step-by-step' line of advance and 'the policy of Sir Antony MacDonnell' are evidently conceived to be much the same thing—a circumstance which renders it necessary to consider the latter.

The difficult question for us is, What is Sir Antony MacDonnell's policy? Nobody seems to know this with certitude; and Sir Antony himself, in a recent speech in

Dublin, said he was not entitled to tell his audience the grounds upon which the 'message of hope' which he wished to convey to them was based ; but, he added,

'his firm belief was that the coming year 1907 would see the fruition of many of those hopes which the best Irishmen had for many years entertained. It might not be the fruition of everything which Irishmen had hoped for, but it would be, he believed, the fruition of so much that Irishmen, if they were true to themselves, would make the fountain and the source from which the whole of their hopes might be fulfilled.'

These words are vague, but they certainly foreshadow large legislation for Ireland next year, and they seem also to agree with the 'step-by-step' or 'instalment' policy. The only direction in which we can turn for light as to what Sir Antony MacDonnell's policy is, or may be, is that indicated by Sir Edward Grey's phrase about 'carrying on the policy of Mr Wyndham and Sir Antony MacDonnell where the late Government had left off.' Rightly or wrongly, this is supposed to mean Devolution ; and, in the absence of any better guide to Sir Antony MacDonnell's intentions, we shall consider the policy commonly known as Devolution. It is in any case desirable to discuss Devolution here as one of the policies competitive with Home Rule.

The Devolution policy, in its present form, originated with the Irish Reform Association, a body of Irish country gentlemen, whose president is the Earl of Dunraven. Lord Dunraven has various claims to fame. In 1896 he strove for the America Cup with his yacht 'Valkyrie' ; as chairman of the Irish Land Conference of 1902 he sought to establish such an understanding between landlord and tenant interests in Ireland as would further the policy of land purchase. He failed in the first object ; he succeeded, after a fashion, in the second. The Land Act of 1903 is the result of the Land Conference, which charmed the British taxpayer into providing twelve millions sterling as a golden bridge between what Irish tenants offered and Irish landlords asked. Flushed with so much success, Lord Dunraven ventured into greater fields. His Land Conference represented a compromise of agrarian interests ; his Devolution policy is meant to effect a compromise of political claims ; but in this case

there is no golden bridge. Devolution is a policy, and also a plan or scheme. We shall examine both.

In his pamphlet on 'Devolution in the British Empire,' Lord Dunraven quotes from Mr Chamberlain's manifesto of June 11, 1886, a passage which states that one of the objects which Liberal Unionists must keep in view is 'to relieve the Imperial Parliament by devolution of Irish local business, and to set it free for other and more important work.' This passage sufficiently defines the policy and its object, and indicates its prime origin. Lord Dunraven proceeds to argue that the British Empire is practically carried on by devolution; and he illustrates his theme by instances drawn from all parts of the British Empire, from Jersey to Quebec, and from the Isle of Man to Australia. He analyses the constitutional fabric of the Channel Islands with much gravity. 'Each island possesses a legislature of its own, known as the "States," and each of these assemblies is presided over by a bailiff, who is a nominee of the Crown.' If Lord Dunraven knows as much of Ireland as he appears to know of Jersey, he must be aware that a bailiff is not a very popular person in the larger island—not even one 'who is a nominee of the Crown.' Of course we know that the Jersey bailiff is a quite different sort of dignitary from the kind known in Clare. But what of that? Who cares how Jersey is governed? There has never yet been a general election fought on the question, and we doubt if there ever will be.

The same remark applies to some of Lord Dunraven's other 'modern instances.' He gives nearly two pages to Devolution in the Isle of Man. To what purpose? The Strand never resounds with a 'stop press' on the question of what Tynwald does, or leaves undone; if the House of Keys were to lock itself up in permanent session nobody would be seriously excited about it. The case of French Quebec is a trifle more pertinent, but it is not a parallel. Quebec is homogeneous, both racially and in religion; Ireland is far from being homogeneous, and the same remedy could not be applied. Then there is the Dominion itself. 'Each of the seven provinces forming the Dominion has a separate parliament and administration.' Perhaps so; but as Ireland is not a 'province' of anything, the instance proves nothing. There is not much use in

talking about Nova Scotia, or Alderney, or the Isle of Man, or the Crown Colony of Malta; Ireland stands upon a different footing altogether

As for parallels—which are no parallels—drawn from the Indian Empire, there is no use in looking into them. If Ireland were a settlement, she might be governed like North Borneo or Sarawak; if she were a province of a colony, she might be given a suitable government, or parcelled into homogeneous districts with a suitable government for each. But she has never been looked upon in these lights; and, now that she has shared in wielding the Imperial power for a hundred years, it is too late to look on her in any such lights. Ireland, as part of the United Kingdom, wields a power equal in quality with that of England herself; and there is no parallel between a country which has shared in the Imperial power for more than a century and colonies which have never shared in it at all. So much for the parallels by which Lord Dunraven recommends Devolution. It may perhaps be suggested by some Liberal Unionists that, since such statesmen as Mr Chamberlain and the Duke of Devonshire have at one time favoured the devolving or delegating of powers to local bodies as a possible settlement of the Irish question, Devolution of some sort is not an impossibility; but, however this may be, we submit that Lord Dunraven's parallels are absurd.

Coming now to examine the plan of Devolution put forward by Lord Dunraven and his friends, we may say at once that, if he supposes such a scheme will finally satisfy the ruling elements in the Nationalist party, we think he is grossly mistaken. However, let us examine the scheme. In its preparation Lord Dunraven tells us he had the assistance of Sir Antony MacDonnell. We gather that Lord Dunraven and Sir Antony together 'drafted out a rough report'; that the former afterwards 'perfected this to the best of his ability'; and that it was subsequently considered by the Reform Committee 'and amended considerably.' We shall now consider the amended perfections of Lord Dunraven's labours.

The Report proposes (a) 'administrative control over purely Irish finance,' and (b) the devolution of 'certain parliamentary functions connected with local business.' The administrative control is to be vested in a 'Financial

Council,' half elected and half nominated—twenty-four members in all. The elected half is to be elected by groups of county, borough, and parliamentary constituencies—one member from each group; the nominated half is to be nominated by the Crown. One-third of the Council is to retire by rotation at the end of the third year. The votes of the majority should determine the decision of the Council, 'and its decisions should be final, unless revised by the House of Commons on a motion adopted by not less than a one-fourth majority of votes.' 'It would be the duty of the Council to prepare and submit the Irish estimates to Parliament annually.' We are also told that

'the Council should be competent to examine, supervise, and control every item of expenditure . . . to propose such reductions as it considered consistent with the efficiency of the public service, and to apply such reductions and all other savings on the annual estimates to the improvement of the administration and the development of the country's resources.'

As to funds for the Council to work with, it is proposed that the average annual sum now voted for purely Irish services from the Imperial Exchequer (say 6,000,000*l.*) should be assigned for this purpose. We are also told that 'the Council should be entitled to carry forward balances and to meet deficits under one head of expenditure by savings under another. Supplementary estimates would cease to be submitted to Parliament.' It is suggested that the Irish estimates 'might be transmitted through the Treasury Board if for formal reasons this was thought desirable.' It is observed that, 'under the Budget system here contemplated,' all the proposals of the Council as regards reductions and appropriations 'would necessarily come under the cognisance of Parliament, which would afford an adequate safeguard against undue interference with any establishment or service.'

Various criticisms have been passed on this part of the Dunraven scheme. Lord Atkinson, formerly Attorney-General for Ireland, and now a Lord of Appeal, has attacked it on constitutional grounds. He considers it a violation of the principle secured by the Revolution—that money voted by the Commons to the Crown shall be

applied for the specific purposes mentioned in the vote, and for none other. To this, no doubt, the Devolutionists would probably reply that their scheme provides that all the proposals of the Financial Council 'would necessarily come under the cognisance of Parliament.' The fact is, Parliament would delegate certain of its financial powers to the Council, and yet would have cognisance of all that the Council did, and power to upset its proposals by a one-fourth majority. But Parliament could only upset specific proposals. The 6,000,000*l.*, or other contractual sum indicated in the financial scheme, would remain under the control of the Council. We confess we never heard of such a plan. Parliament and the Council would be equal to the two kings of Brentford. In whom does power finally abide? In the Council with its 6,000,000*l.*, or in the House of Commons? In the end Parliament might say, 'We shall give you 6,000,000*l.* a year, but we shall determine how you shall spend it.' In that case where would the power and usefulness of the Council come in? In any other case what would become of the appropriating power of Parliament? Briefly it comes to this: the scheme is either unworkable or unconstitutional. If it is unworkable, it is of no use; if it is unconstitutional, it is inadmissible. Mr Dillon said of the scheme:

'It was absolutely unsatisfactory and unworkable, entirely inconsistent with the well-established principles of free constitutional government; and any attempt to fit it into the English system, as was proposed by its authors, would be utterly impossible.'

We are glad to find ourselves for once in agreement with Mr Dillon. An Advisory Council, with instructions to report on possible reductions of present Irish expenditure, and to suggest more useful applications to Irish objects of the sums which could be thus saved, might do some practical service; the Financial Council of the Dunraven scheme is a perfectly impossible body, both as regards its constitution and its powers, to say nothing of its encroachments on the representative rights of the House of Commons. There are numerous flaws in the details of this part of the Devolution scheme; but it is useless to examine them since the whole plan of the Financial Council is neither constitutional nor workable.

The devolution of parliamentary functions is more easily dealt with. The statutory body which the reformers propose would be 'composed of Irish representative peers and members of the House of Commons representing Irish constituencies and of members of the Financial Council.' As to the powers to be delegated to the statutory body, we find Private Bill procedure set down as one head. Under another head we find power to promote Bills for some of the matters 'now dealt with by Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board and the Board of Works.' Again, we notice that the statutory body is to have power 'to promote Bills for purely Irish purposes,' including those of the category last specified. Finally, it is suggested that the statutory body might also deal with 'such other matters' as Parliament might 'in its wisdom' refer to it. How, we ask, would such reference be effected? 'Parliament' means the King, Lords and Commons; would the reference have to be effected by a regular, formal Act? We hardly see how else it could be done; and we think that, by the time the unlucky reference had been dragged through the fiery furnace of debate in both Houses, it would prove to have been just as easy to legislate on the whole matter at once as to 'devolve' it at an equal cost of time and trouble. We note, too, that nothing is said as to what happens to a Bill when it has passed the statutory body. We should like some illumination upon this, to us, not altogether unimportant matter. The omission is like forgetting to put a head upon the statue, and suggests the absence of any 'old parliamentary hand' from the framing of these Devolution proposals.

Now it is precisely this part of the Devolution scheme that interests us most. Is this statutory body to be a legislature, or is it not? If it is, then it is Home Rule; if it is not a legislature, then what is it? The Union cannot stand, as Unionists interpret it, if any second legislature be erected in the United Kingdom. We note that the authors of the Devolution scheme, in assigning Private Bill legislation to the statutory body, make some deceptive references to the Scottish Private Bill Procedure Act. They omit to state that there is no kind of legislature set up in Scotland for the purposes of that Act; nothing but a local tribunal for conducting the enquiries now made by the Private Bill Committees of the House

of Commons. We understand that it was the intention of the late Cabinet to have extended this principle to Ireland in the near future. Lord Atkinson, in criticising the statutory body says :

'But, having created a local legislature, the authors of the scheme do not trust it. They give it no power over finance, no power over the executive, and no power to impose or collect taxes.'

To this we may add that the presence of nominated members in the Legislature is contrary to all established principles of the English parliamentary system. We do not feel that more need be said in condemnation of this strange hotch-potch of legislative and administrative suggestion commonly called Devolution—a scheme which would obviously place the Irish Government upon an inclined plane, leading inevitably to Home Rule. Not the least of the arguments against it is that nobody has asked for it, and that it will satisfy nobody.

Before passing from these political issues, we feel it necessary to notice another matter. We have seen it suggested that the Bill which the Government intends introducing next year is one establishing some species of elective council for the control of administrative bodies in Ireland, and the co-ordination or amalgamation of many of these bodies. We cannot, of course, criticise a merely rumoured programme; but the rumours lead us to make some remarks having a definite connexion with recent facts. One of the first things the present Government did when it came into power was to appoint a Commission to enquire into the working of the Irish Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction. Now this Department is the only Irish central administrative body which actually exhibits in itself something of one of the plans which the Government is credited with contemplating. The Council of Agriculture and the Agricultural Board and Board of Technical Instruction, which exercise a large control over the Department, are bodies of which two-thirds are popularly elected—a favourable contrast with the 50 per cent. of nominated members on the Dunraven Financial Council. In addition, the Department of Agriculture unites within itself several Government boards which were

formerly separate, while much of its work is carried on co-ordinately with that of several other bodies, notably the Congested Districts Board, and the Board of Intermediate Education. Yet, in deference to an entirely one-sided, sectional clamour, the Government chose to appoint a Commission of Enquiry to investigate the working of the only central body in Ireland which really represents a popular devolution of administrative, not legislative, power, and represents also that very principle of co-ordination on which the Dunraven party lays stress.*

No doubt it may be said that the very fact of the Cabinet contemplating such a policy is the justifying reason for such an enquiry; that it is desirable to see how an existing scheme of elective control is working in order the better to frame further schemes of a like nature. Yet every one knows that it was for no such reason that the Commission of Enquiry was appointed; it was set on foot to please Mr Dillon and the 'Freeman's Journal.' We cannot, of course, anticipate the report of the Commission here; we can only draw attention to the fact that several important witnesses have expressed astonishment at such an enquiry being instituted at all. These gentlemen represented different shades of political and religious opinion in different parts of Ireland; and their evidence, together with the general weight of other testimony, has been of such a nature as to justify the Department of Agriculture as against its critics. The reason of this is not far to seek. The majority of persons best qualified to give evidence consisted of members of those local bodies which have so greatly assisted the operations of the Department; its critics have been mostly men who have stood aloof and have done nothing to help its working, but have preferred to visit its proceedings with abuse, disguised as criticism—sometimes not even so disguised.

Up to the present, the result of the enquiry has been not merely to vindicate the Department, but to show that it enjoys the confidence of the more intelligent and helpful elements in Ireland, whether in Ulster or else-

* See 'Ireland in the New Century,' caps. 8, 9, and 10, which fully explain the inception, creation, constitution, and working of the new Department.

where. There were a few isolated explosions of perfectly accountable—and discountable—wrath from interested quarters; a few proprietors of unground axes or unadopted fads spoke sorely; but the general volume of testimony has, so far, been such as to warrant us in saying that, if the Department is to go on enjoying the confidence of Ireland—the Ireland that includes Ulster—it must be so far left alone as not to be made the sport of change, effected as an appeasement of critics whose outlook is from the political platform, not from the economic standpoint. We make these remarks because we are anxious to prevent, if possible, any destructive interference with one of Mr Gerald Balfour's most valuable pieces of Irish legislation. The Department of Agriculture is laying the foundations of the economic future of Ireland; it needs an atmosphere of confidence and quietude for its efficient working; and it is the last institution in Ireland that should be made the subject of political, or semi-political, changes.

Having dwelt with the political issues to which we adverted at the outset, we may now turn towards those more important, albeit less exciting, questions which rise before the mind of every really thoughtful student of the Irish problem. In a country such as Ireland, almost wholly agricultural, the main economic issues will always be agrarian; and upon the right treatment of these all will depend. There are other questions too at which we shall more briefly glance; but our chief present concern must necessarily be with that bundle of related problems which, more conveniently than accurately, are called the land question.

To turn suddenly from the stress of the reigning Irish political topic to these quieter questions may seem to some persons almost gratuitously academic. To us, upon the other hand, the Dunraven proposals which we have just discussed seem academic affairs as compared with such vital, pressing problems as that of the congested districts of the west of Ireland, or the acceleration of land purchase. A sort of Irish 'Duma,' with limited powers and limited financial resources, would be sadly nonplussed when, at its earliest sittings, sheaves of resolutions arrived from local public bodies in the west calling

for the instant treatment of the congestion problem. It is surely better for us to face those questions which neither the Financial Council nor the statutory body could attempt to handle with any hope of success, than to waste further time in discussing Devolution. Our wish is to see the fruitful and constructive line of policy begun by Mr Gerald Balfour in 1895 carried on without a break to its final conclusion. Were this done, Ireland would, we feel confident, become a prosperous and contented country; and the Irish sphinx would devour no more Chief Secretaries for having failed to solve her importunate riddle. The Government itself has not failed to recognise the importance of those problems, and has appointed Commissions to enquire into a number of them. It has already legislated—none too wisely, we think—upon one of them, the labourers question. On this legislation we shall have a few remarks to make presently, but shall in the main pursue the lines of the constructive policy begun in 1895—lines with which the trend of the Government's several Commissions largely coincide.

In appointing a Commission to enquire into the grave problem of rural congestion in Ireland, the Government took a wise step, assuming, as we hope we may, that they really mean to deal comprehensively with the subject when the Report comes in. We say comprehensively, because the problem is a much broader and deeper one than is implied in the misleading term 'congestion.' At least half the holdings in Ireland are very small; some 200,000 of these small holdings are considered to be uneconomic—that is to say, their working profit will not cover the living expenses of the occupier and his family. In the districts scheduled as 'congested' the poverty of the land is not unfrequently a greater evil than the smallness of the holdings. In these cases the balance of the cost of living has to be eked out by wage-labour, by harvesting in England, and by remittances from sons and daughters in America. These poor western folk live upon the brink of starvation; a fortnight's heavy rain may entail the ruin of their potato crop and long months of misery. Bad as things still are along the impoverished western seaboard, they were worse seventy years ago. The crowded squalor of the mud-cabins in the pre-famine era was the concomitant of

indescribable poverty; the swarming sties of those days were swept by wave upon wave of typhus. Then came the dreadful famine of 1846-47. Peel tried, with some success, to alleviate its earlier stages; Russell and the Whigs bungled the rest of it. Hosts of people died of fever, inanition, and sheer hunger—hundreds of thousands in all. Vast emigrations followed; nevertheless, so great had the population of western Ireland been, that even to-day it has not been brought down to anything even resembling an economic figure.

The prime origin of the congestion in the west of Ireland was a bad and neglectful system of landlordism, helped, no doubt, by political causes, and a tenacious perseverance of old tribal habit. The famine shattered the whole economic system of western Ireland; and the bankrupt landlords had neither the means nor the intelligence to reconstruct the frame of things. They were cleared out under the Encumbered Estates Act—a drastic piece of legislation; and their places were taken by speculative buyers from many quarters, men whose whole concern was not how to succour the hapless people, but how to exploit their newly-bought properties.

‘The new owners naturally proceeded to make the most of their purchase; and the way to make the most of their purchase clearly was to sweep out the cotter-tenants and throw the land into large holdings. This some of them proceeded to do; and the consequence was a period of evictions almost vying in cruelty with the famine. Whole districts were cleared and relet in large holdings; cabins were being thrown down in all directions. A thousand of them were levelled in one union within a few months, and the inmates were cast out helpless, half-naked, starving, to go to the union or perish. The cabins were burned that the people might not return to them.’ (Goldwin Smith, *Irish History and the Irish Question*, p. 184.)

Whatever else happens, this at least we must not permit to occur again.

The congested districts are situated in nine counties. They contain one-ninth of the total population of Ireland; their area is one-sixth of the whole country; but their poor-law valuation is only one-nineteenth of that of the agricultural holdings in Ireland. The first step towards applying a remedy to western congestion was taken in

1891 by Mr Arthur Balfour, then Chief Secretary for Ireland. 'The policy of the Congested Districts Board,' writes Sir Horace Plunkett, 'was a notable advance upon the inaction of the State in the pre-famine times, and upon the system of doles and somewhat objectless relief-works of the latter half of the nineteenth century.' The Board, now assisted in its working by the Department of Agriculture, has done much to improve the condition of many districts of the west. Yet it has but touched the fringe of the question. It is to be hoped that the Royal Commission will arrive at some means of deciding what is an 'economic holding.' According to a recent estimate, between 50,000 and 70,000 holdings still remain to be dealt with in the scheduled areas, while in the rest of the country but little readjustment of too small or too poor holdings has taken place. Very large operations will be necessary. These will, in all probability, have to include State expropriation in the western districts, the migration of families and the enlargement of holdings, the furnishing of implements and gear to many of the holders in order to give them a fresh start, instruction in proper methods of farming, and so on.

The task will be no light one. In several districts not only the holdings but the holders are uneconomic; while many of the latter have habits and notions that are not merely unsanitary, but almost uncivilised. Practices unheard-of in the east of Ireland make anything like progress in the arts of cultivation well-nigh impossible. One of these is the 'rundale' system of holding land in scraps and patches—a survival of ancient tribal usage. A man may have fifty of these patches scattered everywhere through the neighbourhood; and yet his 'holding,' thus made up, may be only a few acres in all. These petty plots, too small for fencing, hardly repay cultivation, because, if the lessee's neighbours neglect their plots, he is sure to suffer. Advance under such a system is impossible; yet the tenacity of ancient custom, with its underlying ideas of tribal socialism, makes it extremely difficult to uproot. Uprooted, however, it must be, together with the unsanitary practices and primitive notions and methods which go with it. These things, survivals in remote and backward corners, are not of course universal in the west; they are chiefly practised, as a recent writer

tells us, by 'men and women who, far removed from the highways of modern industry, suffer, perish, and are forgotten.' To convert these poor, backward, untrained people into efficient, self-dependent tillers of economic holdings is an administrative task of enormous difficulty, compared with which the merely legislative and financial part is as nothing. But the task must be faced.

The problem is a grave one—Ireland's gravest, and one that has long called aloud for settlement. It is certain that there is not enough untenanted arable land in Ireland to make the whole of these 200,000 holdings economic; and the greater the number successfully provided for, the greater will be the wail of the large remnant who, under the present outlook, cannot be provided for. Some vast system of drainage, coupled with reclamation of waste land and bog, may yet render the problem of congestion soluble in its entirety. But that is for a more distant day; and meanwhile present needs are pressing. Nevertheless, the duty of the Government is clear; they must begin to handle this question unless they are determined to ignore the unceasing complaints from the west, and the almost certain recommendations of their own Commission. We turn now to another great branch of the agrarian problem.

Outside Ireland there is a cheerful belief that the Irish land question was settled by the Land Act of 1903; but it is a belief not warranted by facts. Fully to understand why this is so, the enquirer should study Dr Bonn's excellent monograph on the Irish agrarian problem. We must more briefly indicate the reason here. Under the Act of 1903 Parliament authorised the issue by the Treasury of an advance of 100,000,000*l.* for land purchase in Ireland; but the money is issued at a rate so slow that thousands of the present tenants may never see the purchase of their holdings effected. Meantime such occupiers as have succeeded in getting an advance for the purchase of their holdings enjoy reductions of annual charge ranging from 10 to 40 per cent. on what their less fortunate neighbours have to pay. The disparity of conditions thus created is only too likely to produce an effect little dreamt of by those who hoped that the Wyndham Act would swiftly settle the whole Irish land question. While admitting that the Act of 1903 will effect large sales, Dr Bonn

proceeds: 'But even to-day it is also possible to affirm that the Wyndham Act will not be the last Irish Land Act' (p. 148). Having pointed out several reasons why there will be limitations to the universal progress of land purchase in Ireland, Dr Bonn adds, 'We shall soon see the rise of a new agitation whose watchword will be compulsory expropriation' (p. 150).

The latest official information does not make the prospect any brighter. In their Report just published, the Irish Estates Commissioners inform us that down to March 31, 1906, they had advanced 9,855,046*l*. That is to say, in two years and five months less than one-tenth of the hundred millions had been issued. At this rate it would take twenty-two years to issue the remaining ninety millions. During the period referred to (November 1, 1903-March 31, 1906) agreements for purchase to the extent of more than 35,000,000*l*. had been notified, so that the advances made are not greatly more than one-fourth of what has been applied for. More than four-fifths of the agreements are for 'direct sales,' a proof that the zone system,* with its compulsory sanction, has been effective in expediting agreements. But this would be more satisfactory if it were accompanied by a corresponding acceleration of advances.

Purchase must be pushed on; for purchase is pacification, the first great step towards real progress in rural Ireland. The Land Acts have, as Dr Bonn says, 'contributed not a little to the attainment of a kind of social peace.' It is suggestive and illuminating to note the figures by which Dr Bonn shows that agrarian crime rose as evictions rose, and fell as evictions fell (pp. 76 and 115). These crimes would fall to vanishing point with the disappearance of eviction; and there would be, in many senses, peace in the land. Lord Monteagle once prophesied that if the land question were fully settled the future history of Ireland would be one of uneventful peace. We

* The zone system of the Wyndham Act applies only to judicial tenants, that is, those who have had 'fair' rents fixed by the Land Commission. If such tenants agree to purchase at a price which will allow their annual instalment to show a reduction of not less than 10 nor more than 30 per cent. in the case of second term rents, or 20 to 40 per cent. in the case of first term rents, then the Estates Commissioners must sanction the sale without the somewhat lengthy procedure involved in ascertaining the value of what is sold.

believe so too, and we think the experiment worth trying. 'For centuries the agrarian system of Ireland was indeed so regulated,' writes Dr Bonn, 'that the abandonment of all energetic effort seemed to be justified' (p. 160). The true remedy, then, is to remove all that remains of that 'justification,' and to give Lord Monteagle's prophecy a fair chance of fulfilment.

We do not pretend that the completion of purchase will establish a rural millennium in Ireland. Historical causes have done much to make the Irishman an indifferent, not to say a bad, farmer. We must help him to be a good one. As Sir Horace Plunkett has pointed out, the establishment of a peasant ownership only settles the tenure question, which is but a part of the land question; the cultivation question remains. 'The Irish question,' says Sir Horace Plunkett, 'is the problem of a national existence, chiefly an agricultural existence, in Ireland.' This is indeed *the* Irish question; and we cordially agree with Sir Horace Plunkett when he declares that

'no "magic of property" will avail to establish an agricultural Utopia by means of the economic holding managed, under an uneconomic system, by the uneconomic man. . . . The only way to deal effectively with this problem is to devote to the system and the man some of the thought and care hitherto monopolised by the struggle for the land.'

Quite so; and perhaps we may say a few words here to persuade the average Briton of his own interest in this question, apart even from his moral interest in helping to make Ireland prosperous, and therefore contented and peaceful.

Two questions are inseparably attendant upon land purchase—repayment and agricultural efficiency; they are also inseparably related to each other, and we may treat them together here. The various Land Purchase Acts render the Imperial Government a creditor—a relation which must be provided for and kept in mind. Most of the purchasing tenants have no capital; they are dependent on the produce of the land for the means to pay their annuities. It is therefore essential that the system of tillage and stock-raising should be improved, and kept abreast of the level prevailing amongst foreign

competitors. Unless this is done the pressure of foreign and colonial competition may leave the Irish farmer unable to pay his annuity in full. This would create a very grave situation. The Government could afford to make a slight reduction in the annuity if it struck off the provision for the sinking-fund. But this would establish the Government as a landlord—a position contrary to the whole tendency of the land movement, which has all along had a peasant proprietary for its objective.

Even if this situation were accepted, another difficulty remains. What would happen if the further progress of exterior competition left the Irish farmer unable to pay even his reduced charge, which we must now call merely rent? The State itself must pay the land-stock-holders their dividends, and must get the money wherewith to pay them. Further reductions are out of the question. True, the Imperial Government has its contribution to county authorities in Ireland to fall back upon against deficits. The impounding of this, however, would give the urban communities a grievance against both the farmers and the Government—a situation which would not render the governing of Ireland more easy or agreeable. Were the Imperial Government a landlord pure and simple, reductions would always be possible. It would not, however, be a landlord with a free hand, but a landlord under a load of debt; the land-stock-holders are its creditors; and this insurmountable fact towers up in front of every possible consideration that can be urged upon the subject of the future government of Ireland. All government has an economic basis; and any attempt to plan out the future of Ireland without due regard to the ruling economic factor can only end in disaster.

If, then, we are ever to build a prosperous Ireland upon the basis of a peasant ownership, it is plain that what we may call the agricultural efficiency of the Irish farmer must be our ruling objective. We must render him capable of meeting the pressure of competition, and of paying the annuities on the State's loan in full, so that its extinction may establish him as an owner at last. It is to the Department of Agriculture that we must look as the natural director of this efficiency; but, in order to enable the Department to press forward its work, the

acceleration of purchase is essential. The ninety thousand farmers who have already purchased are fine material to begin work upon; but the great obstruction to a strong beginning, and to improvement in general, lies in the veiled—sometimes the unveiled—hostility shown towards the Department from several quarters. The known, though never frankly avowed, ground of this hostility is the fear that, as better farming would mean higher profit, it would keep up rents, thereby making landlords unwilling to sell. The only remedy finally available is purchase. The Irish tenant, north and south alike, is more than reluctant to share any increase of profit due to his own efforts; and it is vain to look for any real advance in agriculture until the occupier has become an owner. If, then, the cultivation question is to be solved, a free field must be prepared for the operations of the Department of Agriculture. The pacification of rural Ireland through the ending of land agitation consequent upon purchase can alone prepare that field.

Concurrently with the remedial treatment of congestion and the expediting of land purchase, must come a general improvement throughout Ireland in the methods of peasant-farming, and a reform of the home-life of the peasantry. The effecting of both objects must be entrusted to the Department of Agriculture; but its efforts will be largely ineffectual unless supported by a better and more suitable system of education than that now prevailing in Ireland. The Irish Government should encourage those who, with a success somewhat remarkable in view of the difficulties to be overcome, have succeeded in spreading over the country voluntary associations which are the analogues of the 'Syndicats Agricoles' of France, and the leagues of agriculture in Belgium. Working through and with these, the Department of Agriculture would be able to get a better hold on the attention of the farming class, of whom at present too many seem to feel not even the interest of curiosity in the valuable opportunities of instruction which the Department offers them. Once the practical interest of the farmer is roused and (with no prospective increase of rent to damp him) enlisted, it is to be hoped that rural Ireland will begin to live a new life. Out of this busier and brighter life, with the aid of a better education, we

may hope to see the advent of a better type of peasant home in Ireland, and a better conception of home-life.

In the effecting of these objects some money may have to be spent and some perhaps lent. 'The Irish tenant,' says Dr Bonn, 'often has not sufficient capital to work his holding.' It were better that he should borrow it from the State at moderate rates than be thrown into the hands of the provincial moneylender. Irish farmers have received loans from the Board of Works for drainage and other improvements; and it might be wise to offer similar loans to supply that lack of capital which a bad system of ownership did so much to prevent their acquiring. For this reason there should be a due margin left between the purchase price and the value of the security. These advances, however, might be cheerfully made if the pacification of the country rendered large reductions of expenditure possible. If the general line of policy we have sketched were duly followed up, we feel convinced that the Irish land question, with all its attendant troubles, would be laid to rest.

It is hard to suppose that, if the economic prosperity of rural Ireland were once assured, a cessation of emigration would not follow, with a possible uprising of urban industries. As a preliminary to these, rural prosperity is necessary; urban industries will not grow where the country is sunk in decay. But, though we should look mainly to the prosperity of the country as the best foundation for the prosperity of the town, we know that other things are needed too. One of these is facility of transit. Ireland, it must be remembered, has already some few industries, even outside Ulster; and the expansion of these should become more possible if transit facilities were improved. How this should be done we are not prepared here to discuss; it is one of those questions concerning which the Government has appointed a Commission. We note also that the enquiries of the Royal Commission on Canals are to be extended to Ireland, a country possessing several canals that might be turned to good account. What these Commissions may report we cannot say, but we hope that some helpful suggestions may come from their labours.

But, though we would found the prosperity of the towns on that of the country, we nevertheless think that

a better, more modern, and more character-building system of education will be needed if all the latent capacities of the Irish people are to be fruitfully elicited. In all respects this is necessary. We cannot have an educated public opinion without an educated people; in Ireland there is neither the one nor the other. The newspapers do the tutoring of the public mind, and they do it ill. The consequence is that there are few countries in which the air is so thick with fallacies, economic and political, or so heavily charged with unexamined, blindly-accepted, traditional prejudices. Until this atmosphere, and the tendencies which flourish in it, have been dissipated, we dare not hope for any vigorous developments of modern industry in Ireland. But we believe that the prosperity of rural Ireland would give a sufficient impulse of energy to the towns to make the demand for a suitable system of modern education too strong to be successfully resisted. Meantime something can be done. The primary and secondary systems of education now existent in Ireland could be improved and co-ordinated. The primary system must be improved before technical instruction can make real headway; the secondary system should be so elevated as to become the fitting basis of a genuine course of university education.

Here we must refer to the last of the Commissions appointed by the Government—that to enquire into the working of Dublin University and of Trinity College, Dublin, and to report how their usefulness may be extended. For our own part we naturally regard Dublin University as the only possible nucleus of one great national university for Ireland; but we feel that it is still premature to look for the realisation of that ideal. Failing this, we should like to see the proposals for the reform of the University, recently put forward by a large body of the fellows and professors of Trinity College, accepted by the Roman Catholics of Ireland and recommended by the Commission. We cannot say that we favour the idea of a second college in Dublin University, under any conditions likely to be acceptable to the Roman Catholic bishops; a new college under the Royal University would be more suitable—if a new college there must be. We are keenly aware both of the importance of the Irish University question, and of the crucial diffi-

culty of settling it. It is perhaps the very toughest of all the riddles of the Irish sphinx. We cannot debate it at length here. Two remarks we must make, however. One is that the Roman Catholic hierarchy does not appear to be giving much help towards the solution of the question; the other is that no settlement of it can be satisfactory which does not provide for the Roman Catholic laity of Ireland such an education as will fit them for their place in the modern world. No settlement will be more than a makeshift which does not satisfy this requirement; even a makeshift, however, might be better than the present disastrous state of affairs; and we look forward to seeing some earnest attempt made to deal effectively with this signally important question.

We have now completed our survey of Irish affairs, and it seems to us that the real problems of Ireland are those which we have described, and some of the main lines of solution those which we have sketched. We can hardly conceive how the Dunraven statutory body could deal with these large questions; the relatively slight savings which the Financial Council could effect would only furnish a little more solder for a little more tinkering. It is not tinkering nor peddling that is wanted now, but large, comprehensive measures, such as only the Imperial Parliament could initiate. A Dublin 'Duma,' with no control of the executive, no power of taxation, and strictly limited financial supplies, could do nothing to cure the congestion evil or to quicken land purchase. It would have neither the power nor the money necessary to deal with the great problems we have noticed, problems whose settlement must precede the stoppage of emigration and the building up of that agricultural efficiency upon which the repayment of more than one hundred millions of money and the whole future prosperity of the greater part of Ireland is to depend. These are not questions which can be left to settle themselves, nor entrusted to a mere talking, resolving statutory body, endowed with too little authority to have any respect for itself, or to raise any respect in a nation which is above all things susceptible to the influence of prestige.

We have attempted to distinguish between the essentials of the still unsettled Irish question and the party

issues with which it seems likely to be confused. It is regrettable that, while the party now in power is, so far as can be judged by the utterances of its leading statesmen, ill-prepared for a constructive Irish policy, the Unionists are in a no better position for constructive criticism of the Government's proposals, whatever they may be. Whatever may be said as to the wisdom of the MacDonnell appointment, a Minister of great promise paid the penalty for his responsibility in the matter by a serious interruption in a brilliant career. The controversy which, as we write, is still raging over the inner circumstances of this incident must gravely impair the strength of the Opposition in any attitude they may assume upon the weighty issues which the promise of an Irish policy by the present Government will, of necessity, bring before Parliament. We may venture to indicate briefly what the attitude of a united Opposition should be.

In the first place, we deprecate any want of internal harmony in the Unionist party at the present juncture. The Opposition is weak in the House of Commons; and it will not be strengthened by the persistence of any small section of it, Irish or other, in correspondence or platform addresses, embodying demands of which the gratification could in no imaginable way embarrass any party but their own. The present is not a time for any changing of leaders in the party. It is a time when those of them who have had longest experience in the governing of Ireland should remain in a position to use that experience with weight and effect in criticising the Irish proposals of the Government. We think that these proposals should be examined upon their merits, constitutional and economic, in the light of their probable effect upon the good government of Ireland, and without the least reference to the exigencies of any sectional aims or claims within the ranks of the Unionist party itself.

In the second place, a purely negative attitude, even if it were statesmanlike in normal political conditions, would, as things are, be deplorably weak. It was too little recognised by the rank and file of the Unionist party, least of all by the Irish section of it, that Mr Arthur Balfour and his brother initiated and developed an Irish Unionist policy which prepared the way for the Land Act of 1903, the most generous concession that Great Britain

ever made to the poorest portion of the United Kingdom. This policy, as we have shown, contained an element of Devolution, perhaps as much as could be safely conceded at the present time; for not only was local government put upon a democratic basis, but, under the Agricultural and Technical Instruction Act of 1899, central government functions were largely placed under the control of representative bodies. Any wider extension of administrative devolution based upon experience may be favourably considered. When it is proposed to go further, a large question of principle arises; and it is upon this question that the advocates of what we may fairly call the Balfourian policy and the supporters of the 'larger' policy may have to join issue.

The danger which we most keenly apprehend at the present crisis is the subordination of sane and practical statesmanship to a species of philosophic Radicalism for which Ireland is, to say the least, ill-prepared. In the epilogue written in reply to his critics, Sir Horace Plunkett, who has devoted himself to the practical development of the Balfourian policy, has endeavoured to meet the plausible argument 'that the sense of responsibility, needful for industrial as well as every other kind of progress, cannot be developed in a people so long as they are denied the essentials of responsible government.' And with his reply we are inclined to agree.

'Admitting, for the sake of argument, that responsible government does not exist in Ireland, I reply that, in any country where individual freedom exists, a sense of responsibility can be developed in the process of striving for constitutional betterment no less than in the enjoyment of the attained result. Every worker in the new intellectual and industrial movements acts upon this theory. On the question of principle there are then two distinct courses which present themselves as practical politics—*constitutional change as a means to national advancement, and national development as a means towards the attainment of whatever may prove to be constitutionally best.* Whichever course may be theoretically right, I claim for my plan that it at least furnishes the better working hypothesis.'

Art. XIII.—THE RUSSIAN GOVERNMENT AND THE MASSACRES.*

THE news which we have received from Russia has not as yet been checked by serious study; and in Russia it is only of late that trustworthy books could be published even on the most important phases of recent Russian history. That country has been audaciously exploited by sensation-mongers, Russian and European; and news on the 'pogroms' (massacres), and on the responsibility for them, is, by the nature of things, 'tendentious.' One of the chief causes of this evil is the attitude of the Russian Government. No one in his senses would accuse all the officials wholesale of propagating massacre; yet, if certain officials have done so, we should naturally expect them to be brought to justice. But in Russia no official can be prosecuted at law without the permission of his own official superiors; and, in practice, the irresponsibility

* This article is based mainly on the following authorities, published and unpublished:—1. Report of the Senior Factory Inspector of the Government of Kherson on the events of July 17–19, 1903, in Odessa (published in 'Russkoye Dyelo,' July 1905). 2. Memorandum of the Minister of Finance to the Emperor on the same subject (*unpublished*). 3. Government Reports (Revisionnyye Otchety) of Senator Turau on the events of October 18–20 (October 30–November 2), 1905, in Kieff (*unpublished*). 4. Government Report (Revisionnyi Otchet) of Senator Kuzminsky on the events of October 18–20 (October 30–November 2), 1905, in Odessa (*unpublished*). 5. Account of the events of October 18–20, 1905, in Odessa, dictated by Prof. Stschepkin (*unpublished*). 6. Law Report of the proceedings in connexion with the trial of the Governor of Minsk, General Kurloff (including the Report of the Crown Prosecutor of the Law Chamber of Vilna). 7. Diary of an Englishman in Kharkoff for the days October 22–November 8, 1905 (*unpublished*). 8. Statements made to the writer on events in Nizhny-Novgorod, Sarátóff, Revel, and Moscow, and on the organisation of the Police Department, and other subjects. 9. Government Report by Actual Councillor of State Sávích on the events of January 12 and 13 (25 and 26), 1906, in Gomel. 10. Report to the Minister of the Interior from the Director of the special section of the Police Department, Councillor of State, Makároff. 11. Speech of Prince Urúsoff in the Imperial Duma on June 8 (21), 1906. 12. 'Appeals' of the 'Union of Russian Men,' of the 'Moscow Gazette,' and of others. 13. Circulars and telegrams of various officials. 14. Government Report of Mr Frisch, Member of the Council of Ministers, on the events of June 1–4 (14–17), 1906, in Byelostok. 15. Report on the same by the Commissioners of the Imperial Duma. 16. Debates on the same in the Imperial Duma (official verbatim report). 17. 'Une page de la Contre-révolution Russe.' By E. Seménoff. Paris: Stock, 1906. Authorised translation, with introduction by L. Wolf (to be published shortly). London: Murray, 1906.

claimed by the autocrat is extended even to his most unworthy representatives. Prosecution of an official is understood to endanger the prestige of the Emperor. It is accordingly very rare; and real punishment of an official is rarer still. Both Mr Goremykin and Mr Stolýpin, while ready to accept certain reforms, have clung most tenaciously to the old claim that the sovereign may make exceptional laws, and thus reduce to absurdity all paper guarantees for the freedom of the subject and for the observance of law by officials. It is indeed this general attitude of the Government that explains how organised massacre has become possible.

Our enquiry is founded almost exclusively on documents emanating from the Government itself, and on information supplied to the writer by men who are or have been high Government officials. There is no reason why other information should be excluded; but in the confidential and unpublished reports of Senators Turau and Kuzminsky, who were despatched by the Government to make investigations on the spot, and in the similar report of Mr Sávich and the speech of Prince Urúsoff, there is evidence abundantly sufficient to convict on the main issue. We use, then, principally the confessions of the Government as to the conduct of its own officials.

From the time of Peter the Great, who has been described as a 'Robespierre on the throne,' there have been two opposing currents in Russian thought. The wholesale admission of Western ideas led to a counter-movement based on the instinct of self-preservation, or, as the Russians say, 'self-existence.' The Slavophil is the champion of this anti-Western creed. The first Slavophiles were men of great breadth, not unlike the best English Conservatives. But, as the Government began to take up their formula and to apply it in its own way, both their numbers and their moral importance dwindled fast. Mr Gringmut, the present editor of the 'Moscow Gazette,' is but a parody of the great Katkoff. He represents, not Russia, but the system of frontiers and passports and police and humble obedience to a divinely appointed Tsar. He still maintains that there are two kinds of truth, one for Russia and one for the West; and, as his opponent, the Liberal, takes the West for his model, he is even able

to identify the Liberal with the foreigner. He and the little gang of men gathered round him, enjoying the special protection of the Government, appeal incessantly to national hatreds, to racial spite.

These doctrinaires of the Second Reaction (1881-1904), whether editors like Mr Gringmut or high officials like Mr Pobyedonóstseff, desired to be at any cost 'truly Russian.' Thus, to be an alien was, in their eyes, to be a born criminal. The attacks of the period on the local liberties of the Baltic Germans and the national liberties of the Finns were essentially doctrinaire. These liberties were not dangerous to the Government, but they might become so; the doctrinaires took precautions in advance.

The Jews are, of course, those amongst the people of Russia who will be the last to find their political salvation. Whereas the Finns are by tradition a constitutional monarchy, the Jews are by tradition a scattered and persecuted race. As Church and Tsar were supposed to march together, they had a double reason for expecting persecution in Russia. They have had to learn to live by their wits; as one of them explained to us, 'the Jews are cheats (*obmanshchiki*) but not rogues (*moshenniki*); they must cheat to live.' Their candles, their sacred meat, were taxed in order to provide them with schools, which in many cases are never founded at all. In the public schools, even inside the Jewish pale, only a certain percentage of Jewish pupils is allowed; the last few places will go to those who can bribe the highest; and, in Russia, exclusion from school means exclusion from the professions. Jews are excluded from all higher posts in the Government service; they cannot be officers in the army. When Russia annexed Poland the Government did not wish to admit the Polish Jews into the interior; and a Jew has to pay heavily to live in the capitals. Though the Empire is now commercially one, the Jew can neither come to St Petersburg to claim a debt, nor bring the debtor before a court in the Jewish pale. If these limitations were swept away, the Jews would be satisfied with something far short of revolution. 'The Jews,' said a Russian governor to the writer, 'are quite right to rise; their position is intolerable.' 'They have naturally tried to get round the law,' writes Senator Turau. 'Many had to be educated abroad; . . . they were

good soil for our revolutionaries to work on; and when they came home they soon persuaded their fellows.'

'By unanimous reports of all who have studied the local life,' writes Turau, 'no racial hatred between the Little Russian and Jewish populations of Kieff has ever been observed.' The Roman Catholic Bishop of Vilna, Baron Roop, says the same of his diocese. Yet the Jews undoubtedly 'bled' the local Russians in the days of Polish rule; even now, though wonderfully clever in supplying local needs, they are not so much traders in the Western sense as the parasites of trade. After a Jew has leased some land, it is often not worth having. As occasion offered, the local population might try to recover by violence and all in one day what the brain of the Jew had won from it during many years; as the rioter espied in the Jew's shop objects which had once been his own, 'he would feel,' says a reactionary, 'as if the Jew had been draining his blood.' So far, then, anti-Jewish riots in Russia are not different from those recorded in the history of other primitive peoples.

The carrying-out of the special laws against the Jews naturally devolved upon the police. This brought Jews and police into undesirably close relations. The official, backed by the whole weight of Imperial authority, was the natural enemy of every Jew. The Jew took pride in finding 'ways round the law.' His best course was to bribe the official; and no one can compete with him in his knowledge of Russian venality. Tsikhotsky, a Kieff official implicated in the 'pogroms,' made it a part of his defence that the Jews hated him because he would not take bribes; yet, in point of fact, he was convicted of this very offence long before the events in question.

The part of the Jews in recent politics must be very carefully defined, though the 'Moscow Gazette' and its friends have been allowed to indulge in the most wholesale generalisations, confounding revolution with reform, Zionist with Terrorist, and the Russian students and Intellectuals with the Jewish population. The question of Zionism is a purely Jewish question. There are some Zionists who desire a return to Palestine; and there are others who would like to found a self-governed Jewish colony somewhere else outside Europe. The Zionists, who are a small minority of the Jews, were not strong

in the working-classes; they had the goodwill of the Russian Government, which at one time would have been glad to get rid of them on any terms. Yet an appeal to the Russian soldiers, printed in the press of the military staff at Odessa, has the impudence to say:

'The Jews want to make our Mother Russia into a kingdom not Russian but Hebrew or Sionist . . . and to proclaim in Russia their own Jewish or Sionist Tsar. And then, lads, they will destroy our Christian faith, too, as they destroyed and killed Christ.'

In general politics the Jews have naturally taken a prominent part. The small Terrorist bodies in South Russia and some parts of Poland consist largely of Jews. The powerful Jewish 'Bund,' which is very strong among the working-classes, is revolutionary in its aims and methods, but it is not ordinarily Terrorist. The 'Union for the Full Rights of Jews,' which has several Sionist members, is *bourgeois* and not revolutionary at all. It is closely connected with the Russian Liberals; it organised a most successful electoral campaign in conjunction with the 'Cadets,' and it supplied some of the most prominent Liberal leaders to the late Duma.

On the other hand, there is no doubt that the Jewish revolutionaries are responsible for a large number of murders of policemen during the last two years. They seized the chance of paying off old scores, and they had more to pay off than the average Russian. The murders were in number and in character such as to preclude all possibility of palliation. Mr Stakhóvich estimated them in the Duma at something over seven hundred; and, as he reasonably put it, not all the victims could have been villains; in fact, many of them belonged to the better sort of police, who stuck to their posts in the face of danger. The names of the criminals were more often Jewish than not. Though the murders were usually committed in a dastardly way—by shots at night from behind street-corners—a Jew boasted to the writer that they were nearly all the work of his own people; that the murderers were often ignorant agents of others 'whose lives were too valuable to lose'; and that the murders established a title to the remedying of Jewish grievances, 'because the Jews had thus shown their pluck.'

The time arrived when it became a part of the Government policy to fight revolution with revolutionary weapons. The Minister of Finance, in his Memorandum to the Emperor, assigns as this date the year 1901. In this year, he says, attempts were made by the Ministry of the Interior to organise propaganda through the police amongst the working-men. He mentions General Trepoff as one of the chief champions of this scheme. His own representations were, he says, flouted by the Minister of the Interior (Plehve) and by Mr Pobyedonóstseff. He maintains that the result has been the opposite of what was intended; the revolutionary propaganda, far from having been arrested, has thrown out wider roots; and the whole movement has simply led to disorder.

The first application of this programme is connected with the name of Mr Zubátoff, who, in close collusion with the police, organised lectures for working-men, telling them that the Government was ready to support their claims against their employers. The working-men distrusted him; and in Moscow, though he is said to have had the support of the Grand Duke Sergius, the Metropolitan Vladímir, and the City Prefect, General Trepoff, the movement ended in a fiasco. It was the same in some other places; but in Odessa his agents engineered an artificial strike which threw the town into disorder.

According to the official report of the Senior Factory Inspector of the Government of Kherson, unions of working-men were organised by the gendarme, Vasilyeff, and by a young Jew named Shayévich, who was recommended to the gendarme in instructions from St Petersburg. The Inspector circumstantially describes how, in July 1903, Shayévich organised a general strike; how the Police-master escorted the strikers, and even rescued some of them from the troops; how this official avoided executing the instructions of the City Prefect for the arrest of Shayévich; how a telegram from the Police Department ordered the City Prefect to hear the demands of the men and satisfy them if possible; how Shayévich (who clearly had cognisance of this telegram) for the first time set about drawing up demands, which included the doubling of wages, a reduction of the working day, and, in some factories, a share of the profits for the workmen. The Prefect at last obtained the permission

of the Minister of the Interior to arrest Shayévich ; and during the next four days all the factories resumed work. Zubátoff was ultimately exiled ; one of his adherents was, by his own confession, the priest, Gapon, who organised the petition of January 22, 1905.

The evidence which has just been quoted shows clearly that at the bottom of all the trouble there lies a dualism within the Government itself. This dualism is to be found even in the control of the police.* The ordinary police are under the control of the local Governor ; the local Governor is controlled by the Minister of the Interior. The gendarmes, or political police, are a distinct organisation ; they are few in number, but they can compel the ordinary police to co-operate with them without necessarily assigning their reasons for action ; there is therefore very considerable friction between the two bodies. The gendarmes are in no way controlled by the Governor ; they receive their instructions direct from St Petersburg. Even in St Petersburg the control is dual ; the Commander of the Corps of Gendarmes appoints and, if necessary, punishes, but he may not give orders ; the Chief of the Police Department gives all instructions, but may not punish.

Let us trace the dualism further. When Count D. Tolstoy was Minister of the Interior, the Assistant-Minister was made in some respects partially independent of him. But in the spring of 1905 General Trepoff, as Assistant-Minister, received an absolute control over the police of the Empire. He was in no way subordinate to the Minister, Mr Bulýghin ; he could and did report separately to the Emperor. It was only on his retirement in October that the special powers of the Assistant-Minister were annulled. General Trepoff divided the Police Department itself into two sections. The non-political work he put into the hands of one of his followers, Mr Garyn ; as special commissioner for the political work, he appointed another, Mr Rachkóvsky.

These details do not display the full extent of the dualism. Till Count Witte became Premier in October 1905, even the theory of the solidarity of Ministries did not exist ; and the practice of it did not even then

* The following details have been verified by an official who held one of the highest posts in that department,

come into use. Each Minister served as the personal nominee of the Emperor; and each might, and generally did, spend much of his time in trying to oust his colleagues and to fill their places with his own friends.

To sum up. The ordinary police are in friction with the gendarmes; the Assistant-Minister is in conflict with the Minister; and the Ministers may all be in conflict with each other. All then depends upon the Emperor; and the knowledge and will-power of Nicholas II are not enough to impose order on this chaos.

Having full control of the police, General Trepoff was, during the summer and autumn of 1905, practically dictator of Russia. The police were separated from the rest of the Government; and Trepoff represented the state of siege, exceptional legislation, and, in a word, ordinances as opposed to law. He himself had only the antecedents of a policeman; and no one ever credited him with any kind of political insight. To make him dictator of Russia was to affront the whole nation. As has been remarked, 'It was like putting a basin of dirty water on the drawing-room table.' Police are necessary in every State; but one hardly likes to confess that the functions of government are all summed up in police work. Nor had Trepoff the support of the men of old family; one such, Prince Urúsoff, who, with the object of showing 'that even a Governor could do good,' had served as Governor first in Bessarabia and then in Tver, wrote to explain that it was impossible for him to carry out the ideas of General Trepoff, and resigned his post. Trepoff himself seemed to have no policy. While Mr Bulýghin laboured at the draft of his half-hearted scheme of a Duma, Trepoff simply prohibited all meetings, which generally were held in spite of his prohibition. Now and then the peasants were invited to sign statements that they were quite contented; and many, like the famous 'Peasants' Parliament' of Chernígoft, flatly refused.

Throughout this period the officials were completely demoralised; and murders of policemen were frequent. But the 'Moscow Gazette' continued to appeal to the memories of Kishineff; and there began to arise something like an amateur organisation for reprisals against the Jews. The group which formed it began to call itself 'the Real Russians'; it always broadly identified reform

and revolution, Liberal and Jew. Certain higher police officials associated themselves with it. On the outskirts of the large towns there could be found a number of loafers who would be ready to loot Jewish shops for a few shillings, for a few drams of vodka, or simply for what they could make out of the process. The system of passports put these men in close touch with the police; and it was not difficult to show them that they were free for a given period to satisfy their nefarious desires with impunity. The earlier of their outrages took place outside the Jewish pale, and were directed as much against the Liberals as against the Jews. Thus Mr Heintze, an admirable social worker and a Liberal, was murdered and mutilated in Nizhny-Novgorod; and Mr Lvoff, who was recently invited to become a minister under Mr Stolýpin, had the Cossack's whip laid about his shoulders in the streets of Sarátoff. Curiously enough, the Governor was Mr Stolýpin; and, though present, he was powerless to prevent the outrage.

It was not, however, till the Emperor signed the Manifesto of national liberties on October 30, 1905, that the 'pogrom' was fully developed as a weapon of reaction. The opposition of the nation to the Government had become more and more tense and concentrated, until a strike of the railway servants showed how unprepared the bureaucracy was, and how easy it was for all trades and professions to drift into a great common movement of passive resistance. The Ministers were paralysed; and Count Witte, the ablest of all the bureaucrats, though disliked at Court and distrusted by the people, was able to make use of the crisis to secure his own return to power. There were, however, byways of officialdom of which he remained ignorant. We can picture the mind of the exasperated police official who saw himself abandoned by his sovereign to the hatred of his many enemies. But he had a policy—that of the 'Moscow Gazette'; he had instruments to hand; and he had a natural enemy—the Jew.

The universities had received the right of self-government early in the previous September. The students were now allowed to hold meetings in the halls; and, in spite of some of their professors, they threw open their doors to the pupils of secondary schools, male and female,

to the organisations of working-men and of Jews, and to the public in general. In Kieff, from September 20 to October 31, there was an almost unbroken series of such meetings. Agitating speeches were made, and agitating telegrams were read out. Though the orators sometimes dissuaded their hearers from any open conflict, the most chimerical ideals were warmly welcomed. Money was collected for the organisation of a militia, one lady offering her ear-rings. The portraits of the Emperor were removed and were replaced by revolutionary inscriptions. On October 31 a crowd broke into the university, destroyed the portraits, and distributed red flags. The orator, Schlechter, cried out, 'The army is ours; let us start'; and, when the news of the Manifesto arrived, he exclaimed, 'The struggle is not yet over; let us go on for a republic.' Outside the town-hall there were shouts of 'Down with the autocracy.' The monogram and inscription were torn from the statue of Nicholas I; some Jews tried to drag the statue down, while others tried to put a red flag in the Emperor's hand. The framed monogram and crown of Nicholas II, which were to have been illuminated in honour of the Manifesto, were torn down by Jewish hands. While the town-hall was thronged by the crowd and almost wrecked, the orator, Ratner, was carried high 'as a future president or minister.' Some Jews spat on the soldiers; to others were attributed such words as 'We gave you your God, we gave you your freedom, and we will give you your Tsars.'

Down to October 26 General Kleigels had been Governor-general of Kieff. On that night he called together the chief officials and handed over his power to the military authorities. General Drake, the head of the military defence, announced that he would use force to prevent street meetings; but on the very next day the helplessness of the new authorities was demonstrated, and several of the soldiers alleged that they had received no instructions. On October 30 General Kleigels was dismissed. General Karass was to occupy the post till the new Governor-general arrived. The action of General Kleigels had put the power into the hands of new men, who depended entirely upon the police for information on the state of the town. Nothing that had happened before October 26 justified this step.

On Oct. 29 a person, believed to be an official, paraded the streets of Kieff with a white flag which bore the words 'For Tsar and Fatherland.' He tried to incite the workmen against the Jews, but met with no success. On October 31 the cry of 'Hit the Jews' was raised, but met with no response. However, while disorder was raging round the town-hall, the cry was taken up again. On a report that a Cossack had killed a man, the crowd attacked five Cossacks, who retired, firing in the air. For two hours the police and the troops stood idle before the town-hall. A squadron of dragoons, arriving on the scene, was shot at from four sides; and stones and bottles were flung at the infantry. One officer now ordered his men to fire in platoons; seven of the crowd were killed and 130 wounded; the rest fled in confusion; of the soldiers fifteen had been wounded. At 5 P.M. a meeting of hotel servants decided to 'give the Jews a lesson.' At 7 P.M. a crowd paraded the Alexander Square, carrying a portrait of the Emperor and singing the national hymn. Casual labourers and street-loafers joined in; a number of Jews carrying red flags were attacked and knocked about; a rush was made for those wards in which the Jews predominated; everywhere houses and shops were sacked and wrecked, the furniture and goods being thrown out of the windows.

The movement rapidly spread and was reinforced by all the bad characters of the town. Some, to the end, contented themselves with destroying property; some avoided houses where the Emperor's portrait was displayed, or spared Jews who could say a Russian prayer; but most of the rioters robbed and killed without mercy. On November 1, with full permission of the troops, a large crowd of workmen, shopmen, and officials, with some priests and soldiers, preceded by national flags and a military band, and carrying portraits of the Emperor, paraded the main streets. The procession listened to a short service before starting; but the hinder ranks engaged in pillage all the way, and some of the spoils were carried just behind the portraits of Nicholas II. Though General Karass forbade the procession and issued a strong rebuke to the troops, this day witnessed the climax of the 'pogrom.' Large Jewish shops were wrecked; some iron railings protecting one warehouse were deliberately

torn down; ledgers and plate-glass were destroyed; pieces of rich velvet lay on the muddy streets. The Jewish school of Mr Brodsky was sacked for two successive days; the Metropolitan and Bishop Plato, who did their best to stop the pillaging, were met with cries, 'So you too are for the Jews.' One robber cynically seized a piece of cloth from a shop to put it under the bishop's feet. Brute force reigned supreme.

On November 2, for the first time, the troops fired on the pillagers, killing five. The pillagers still continued their work, and tried to gain a respite by circulating a false report of the murder of some monks outside the town; but when the troops once showed their mind, the robbers, with grumbling recriminations, dispersed of themselves. On this day order was restored. The victims of the 'pogrom' were, at the lowest computation, 47 killed and 205 wounded.

This typical sketch of a 'pogrom' has been taken entirely, and almost textually, from the longer report of the Government Investigator, Senator Turau; we cannot too much emphasise the fact that it is the Government version. We will now let the same authority deal with the question of the responsibility of the officials.

For purposes of defence the troops had been organised, and the town had been divided into certain districts, each under a general.

'Yet the pogrom lasted for three days, and stopped only when all Jewish shops and many Jewish houses had been ransacked. The police were almost entirely absent. The troops walked slowly down the middle of the street while robbery was proceeding on both sides of them. When private persons or officials asked for help from the troops, the answer was always, "We have no orders." Even the Vice-governor, Raffalsky, though in uniform, had this answer from a squad of Cossacks. Generally a shop already ransacked was guarded by a sentinel, who thought it his duty to stand there paying no attention to the pillage which was going on all round him.'

A bystander and a policeman were told by soldiers that they were only ordered to go up and down the street. One soldier said to a law official, 'We are ordered not to mix with the crowd.' A policeman appealed to a patrol which was watching the pillage of a shop; they replied, 'We are ordered to see that there is no fighting and that

no Russians are hurt.' Some Cossacks told a policeman, 'We are here that no one may fire on the pillagers from the windows and balconies, and that they may not quarrel amongst themselves.' A Crown lawyer asked some policemen why they did not take stolen goods from the pillagers; they answered, 'Now it is impossible, as the authorities are against it.' An officer of the Reserve saw robbers with knives 'literally cutting up two Jews'; ten yards away stood a squadron of cavalry 'looking on quietly and not moving a step.' 'To stop the pogrom was possible without special efforts.' The very soldiers who refused 'to break their oath,' that is, to stop the 'pogrom,' on the very next day, obeying orders, fired on the pillagers and arrested them. The pillagers then asked, 'Where were you before? Why didn't you shoot when the Emperor's pictures were torn down?'

According to numerous eye-witnesses, including officials, some of the policemen and soldiers joined in the robbing and seized goods. 'Many ex-soldiers in uniform took an active part'; 'a lieutenant of artillery was leading the robbers on the Haymarket.' Police-captain Lyashchénko and his assistant Pirozhkoff were in charge of the ward in which most of the sacking took place. 'These two,' says a lieutenant of the Reserve, 'were present during the pillage and took no measures, though policemen and patrols were close at hand.' Some say that on October 31 they shouted 'Hit the Jews and rob them.' Two witnesses assert that Pirozhkoff directed the robbers against a certain shop.

Major-General Bezsonoff was in charge of the second district, in which nearly all the outrages took place. He stood nearly all the time in the square before the town-hall 'quietly looking on and taking no measures.' 'You may wreck,' he said to those near him, 'but you may not rob.' The pillagers shouted 'Hurrah!' and cheered the General. A shop near the town-hall was being sacked; a detachment of troops stood looking on. Bezsonoff joined them; when asked to interfere, he remarked that he would not allow force to be used against the pillagers, and remained a cold-blooded spectator of the scene (evidence of a Crown lawyer). The chief secretary of the Governor-general said to him, 'Your Excellency, there is a pogrom; no measures are being taken; how will you

order me to understand this?' 'What pogrom?' said the General; 'it is a demonstration.' A woman picked up a cloth thrown from a window. 'Do you call that robbery?' said Bezsonoff. 'Why, it's a find.' On November 1 two detectives heard him make a speech to the pillagers 'Boys,' he said, 'you have already hit the Jews enough; you have shown that the Russian people knows how to stand up for its Tsar. Enough of rioting; if you go on wrecking to-morrow, then we will use force.' The robbers shouted 'Hurrah!' and set about making the best use of their time. On that day General Karass summoned him and warned him for the last time that he must carry out orders and act with decision. The next day the 'pogrom' was easily stopped.

General Drake had charge of the military defence of the city. To the repeated orders of General Karass, instructing him to take the firmest measures, he replied that he had done everything necessary. To the chief of a bank who complained of the inactivity of the troops, he replied that 'he did not intend to take advice.' On November 2 General Karass had to notify him that 'persons in command are taking no proper view of the business of defence.'

The police were under the orders of the Police-master, Colonel Tsikhotsky. He had been convicted of taking bribes, but was not removed by Plehve because he had powerful friends at Court. Indeed, they say that he taught the goose-step to the Emperor. Of Tsikhotsky, Senator Turau reports that 'he took no measures whatsoever.' He heard of the 'pogrom' on October 31, and only telegraphed to his subordinates at 10 P.M. on November 1. Two of the generals in charge of districts stated that he sent no message or instructions to the troops. At a meeting of the chief authorities, in naming a house from which a shot had been fired, he confused the two sides of the street. At 4 P.M. on November 1 he was ordered by the council to telegraph its decision to forbid processions; he sent the order at 12.26 the next day. Eyewitnesses, including many officials, state that he 'looked on quietly at the disorders, only saying, "Disperse, gentlemen."' The comment of the pillagers was, 'That is his joke'; and some of them even answered with shouts of 'Hurrah!' He would say, 'Gentlemen, other people's

property is inviolable'; or, 'That will do; go in peace.' He took part in some of the patriotic demonstrations; the crowd 'chained' him, and then dispersed to sack Jewish shops; he bowed to his applauders, and walked off quietly (evidence of a justice of the peace). The Vice-governor ordered him to act with energy; the chief secretary threatened him with 'exile and hard labour.' On November 2 General Karass threatened him with removal. It was only then that he at last took action.

Senator Turan had no power to deal with the military offenders. He removed Tsikhotsky, Lyashchenko, and Pirozhkoff, and handed them over to the law-courts. As yet no public example has been made of these flagrant criminals.

The simultaneous 'pogrom' in Odessa closely resembled that in Kieff. We supplement the short report of Senator Kuzminsky with the statement dictated by Professor Stschepkin, a professor of the local university and late member for Odessa in the Imperial Duma.*

In July 1905 the city was greatly agitated by the revolt of the battleship 'Prince Potemkin.' General Karagózzoff, who then became Governor-general, had no great ability, and seems to have been guided by the City Prefect, Mr Neidhardt. Two prominent Liberals were prosecuted; needless use was made of the troops and police to disperse peaceable crowds. At the public meetings in the university the most revolutionary ideas found expression; and on October 27 the students and schoolboys were out all day in the streets inciting to a general strike. The police met them and knocked them about. On October 29 Mr Neidhardt tried to close the university to outsiders; the young people raised some barricades, and some five or six of them were killed or wounded. On October 30 the Town Council appointed a consultative committee, composed of town councillors and others. This committee, on receiving the news of the Imperial Manifesto, decided to create a kind of local police force. Mr Neidhardt denounced this proposal as usurpation, and pointed to the red flags displayed in the streets, one of which was even flying from the town-hall.

* Prof. Stschepkin has lately contributed a chapter on Napoleon's invasion of Russia to vol. ix of the 'Cambridge Modern History.'

While Mr Neidhardt was receiving the committee, attacks on the Jews had already begun in the outskirts of the city. A Jewish militia had been organised in advance; and, as soon as the 'pogrom' began, the students, arming themselves with revolvers, sent detachments to the points of greatest danger. There was a scarcity of arms, as the police had seized all that they could; but the Jews and the students dealt successfully with the hooligans on October 31 and November 1. But Mr Neidhardt, denouncing the militia as armed rebels, sent the soldiers against them, and platoons fired on every house which the Jews tried to defend. On the morning of November 1 some disguised policemen organised a procession of workmen, house-porters, ragamuffins, and men of the secret service. The procession carried sacred images and portraits of the Emperor, and received the approval of the military commander, General Kaulbars, in front of his palace, and that of Mr Neidhardt in front of the cathedral. The procession pillaged shops and attacked Jews and schoolboys. General Kaulbars, when appealed to, pointed towards the university and said, 'There they are making bombs'—a charge which the Town Council, after making a search, certified to be false.

Senator Kuzminsky quotes the following evidence. A police-captain says that the police accompanied the patrols and ordered them to fire when attacked; 47 shops were pillaged, and 22 persons were killed, most of them Jews. An assistant police-captain says, 'I heard Mr Neidhardt arrange with Mr Gensberg for the transference of police powers from the police; the Police-master, Mr Golovin, refused to remain in office under these conditions.' Another police-captain declares that the troops took no measures against the pillagers. The director of a higher school says that the (first) crowds were agitated but orderly until the police interfered. The police attacked them without reason or warning. They themselves were not attacked throughout October 31. The director of a savings-bank society says, 'A military officer told me that it was not within his competence to defend private property.' A Crown lawyer says, 'In our street the pillagers were exclusively soldiers. I reported this to Mr Neidhardt. . . . In the morning I telegraphed again.

... I saw that there was no desire on the part of the police and the troops to stop the pogrom.'

Mr Stschepkin states:

'Mr Neidhardt printed a letter in which "thirty thousand townsmen" proposed to go and devastate the revolutionary university. On several robbers who were arrested by the Students' Militia while carrying their spoil, there were found new revolvers; and amongst the wounded hooligans lying in the hospital were found some disguised policemen. A hooligan who lay there was asked how he had obtained his new revolver. He replied, "A policeman gave it to me . . . out of friendship."'

Mr Neidhardt, who had himself asked to be recalled, was removed by Count Witte. But, in spite of the recommendations of Senator Kuzminsky, he was never tried by the Senate. On the contrary, he was appointed Vice-governor of Nizhny-Novgorod. Count Witte represented to the Emperor that the appointment was not suitable; but his report was returned endorsed with the remark, 'I know that public opinion is irritated against Mr Neidhardt. But what of that? (*chto zhe iz tovo?*) I appoint him Vice-governor of Nizhny-Novgorod.'* However, the feeling in Nizhny-Novgorod was such that the appointment was cancelled.

There is the same significant coincidence of date in the disorders at Kharkoff, Revel, and Minsk. In Kharkoff the movement began with the looting of armourers' shops by a band of hooligans. The streets filled with spectators; and the Cossacks charged. Our informant—an Englishman, who barely escaped one of the Cossack whips—is explicit in stating that the charging was directed only on the spectators, and that the hooligans meanwhile went on robbing on both sides of the troops. There was, later, a little fighting at a barricade set up by the students, who were in the end allowed to march out, giving up their rifles, but retaining their revolvers. The students were allowed to keep order in the streets during the funeral of the victims. The only disturbance arose from a shot fired out of the funeral procession. The man who fired was seized by the students. Under a disguise he was wearing the uniform of the police.

* Our statement comes at first hand from one who saw the report and the reply.

In Revel, according to the statement of the late member for the town, Mr Papchinsky, a crowd of hooligans, on October 27, ransacked the armourers' shops, and wrecked several other shops. This demonstration seems to have been quite unprovoked. The police were not to be seen; and the troops took no action. On October 29 a large but quite peaceable meeting on the chief square protested against the inactivity of the authorities. Troops arrived and fired on the meeting.

In Minsk, according to the Government report of the Crown Prosecutor, the Governor, General Kurloff, received, on October 25, a telegram from General Trepoff containing these words, 'In case of street disorders taking place, I ask you to take decisive measures to suppress them, not hesitating to resort to armed force.' He was also instructed to call a conference of the chief officials. These reported that revolutionary designs were in the air. The Governor sent out sealed instructions; the troops were informed that force could be used without special warning if crowds showed violence to officers or to soldiers. General Kurloff said to his officials, 'Don't take blank cartridges, and don't fire in the air.' On November 1, permission having been obtained for a meeting, a mixed crowd gathered at the railway station. Many of the speeches were most violent. According to one witness the crowd started firing on the soldiers; but this statement is not borne out by the report of the Crown Prosecutor. Anyhow, the troops began to fire without even the warning of a bugle-call. Most of the victims were wounded in the back. Persons who were hiding in corners and under the staircases were killed. Some policemen killed persons escaping from the station. There were 50 killed and 100 wounded. The soldiers seemed to lose their heads, says the chief of gendarmes, and fired on the staircases or put their rifles to the windows from outside. The news of the Manifesto arrived; but the Governor, by his own account, delayed its publication 'in order to verify it.' The Crown Prosecutor recommended that the Governor should be prosecuted; but, assuming that the crowd started the firing, the Inspector for Military Prosecutions stopped the proceedings.

After the Manifesto there were no 'pogroms' for some time. Count Witte, the Premier, opposed the policy of

massacre; but the 'Real Russians' were still able to execute their vengeance on individuals. Thus, during the December rising in Moscow, while the revolutionaries were showing the futility of violence at one end of the city, some reactionaries raised a sham barricade at the other end; and some dragoons used this as an excuse to burn down the warehouse of Mr Sýtin, who has rendered immense services to the cause of sound literature for the people. The firemen who came to the spot were told by the soldiers, 'This fire you are not allowed to put out.' Most unfortunately for the future of Russia, many priests did their utmost to incite the hooligans against Jews and Liberals. Bishop Hermogen signed provocative appeals in Sarátoff; Bishop Níkon, of Moscow, was a member of a committee formed for a similar purpose; and the Metropolitan Vladímír preached a sermon in a similar sense. On the other hand, an old priest was dismissed from his cure for remonstrating with some soldiers who were beating harmless persons in front of his house; and five priests who preached against the death penalty were dismissed and put on their trial.

The next actual 'pogrom' was that of Gomel, a town where 56 per cent. of the inhabitants are Jews. We confine ourselves entirely to the evidence of Mr Sávich, a member of the council of the Minister of the Interior. The reactionary Minister, the well-known Mr Durnóvo, despatched him to the spot; and most of the persons, whom he interrogated there, were government officials.

In October 1905 the Jewish revolutionaries began to organise a militia. There were only 375 soldiers and 60 policemen in the town; the latter were paid at the rate of 1*l.* 13*s.* a month. 'Between the police, the local gendarmes, and the commander of the local troops, there was continual wrangling; the last-named refused to work in harmony with the police.' The 'Bund' terrorised the population; but the 'Union of Full Rights for Jews' protested against its action. At last a police-captain was murdered.

'There was perhaps still a small party of persons devoted to the old régime; these could not oppose the revolutionaries with a corresponding armed force, and therefore had recourse to such methods as provocation. . . . Quite recently there appeared in Gomel a branch of the secret organisation of

Russian Patriots. . . . It is impossible not to see an active co-operation of the Assistant-commander of Gendarmes with this secret Union, which, though it possibly acts with patriotic objects, yet employs unlawful methods.'

The Assistant-commander was Count Podgorechání-Petróvich.

'My object' (he writes) 'was . . . to receive most useful information about the revolutionary movement . . . and to exert an influence on certain members of the Union which might produce good results from a patriotic view—patriotic in the best meaning of that word,' . . . also, 'to ward off a Jewish massacre . . . I knew that I was taking a step that bordered on crime . . . but decided to materially support the Union that it might be ready to oppose any revolution which might break out in the city.'

No revolution broke out. As to the nature of Podgorechání's 'material support,' we can best judge from the subsequent report of his superior officer, Mr Polyákoff, Commander of Gendarmes in the Government of Mohíloff, who writes to Mr Sávich as follows :—

'Podgorechání has gone, leaving some (financial) deficiencies behind him. I am especially displeased that he showed in our presence a tendency to lie without ceremony. You remember that he told you in my presence that the twenty-five revolvers which he had given to the Gomel Patriotic Union had already been returned. Of the seventy-five revolvers put aside in July by Captain Shebéko (Podgorechání's predecessor, who had been reprimanded for similar conduct), I have found on investigation only thirty-seven. Where are the other thirty-eight? When I pressed Podgorechání to say where the arms had disappeared to, I received the following explanation. In the middle of December 1905, when members of the party of Patriots pressed him to give them arms for self-defence, he did as follows. One evening he took from the chest some twenty-five revolvers, tied them into a bundle, and himself took them to a certain house, where, having rung, he waited until the door was opened, put his hand inside, and gave the package to the man who had opened the door, and then, without being seen by any one, walked quickly away. Podgorechání refused to name the persons to whom he gave the revolvers. In the same secret way a printing-press which had been seized by Captain Shebéko disappeared from his office. I ordered a search to be made; and the press was found at the house of a Patriot. . . . It will be destroyed.'

The 'materials' having been obtained by the Union, two of its members, including one Schwand, 'invited in from the villages' (Podgorecháni) a small band of some ten or fifteen hooligans. These men, 'mostly armed with rifles or revolvers,' attacked certain houses which had been indicated to them. They burned and sacked thirteen houses and shops, and tried to sack the house of Dr Zalkind. A number of street-loafers, who had broken into the dram-shops, joined in the work. Some shots were fired, and some bombs thrown from the houses; but they did no harm. One Jew was killed, and eleven were wounded; of these last, four were under fifteen years of age. The damage done amounted to 200,000*r.* The Colonel in command saw, on January 26, 'seven or eight pillagers dressed in light cloaks like those of Cossacks; they wore fur caps, and had rifles which were undoubtedly of the army model; among them were one policeman and one civilian, who carried booty out of the house.' This man was recognised by Podgorecháni as 'one who was reported to belong to the Union of Patriots.' The Colonel's orders to put out the fire were not heeded by the hooligans, but were subsequently carried out by a patrol of dragoons which he summoned to the spot. The soldiers, according to Major-General Phalenberg, commanding in Vilna, came to the scene as onlookers and without officers or instructions. The infantry and dragoons behaved irreproachably; but the Cossacks, who appear to have been given a holiday for the day (evidence of several officials), seized on vodka, and three of them appropriated plunder; some of them attempted rape on February 8. Podgorecháni, by his own account, came on the scene twelve hours after the disorders were notified to him. The police deny that he ever came at all. We may ask, why should he? He already knew more than they could tell him. Schwand was brought to trial. Mr Durnóvo dismissed Podgorecháni for 'inappropriate action.' No news of his further punishment has yet reached us.

We saw that at Gomel a secret press for the printing of incitements to violence was kept at the gendarmes' office by two successive chief officers. A similar press was now discovered even in the Central Police Department at St Petersburg. Prince Urúsoff, who had put a stop to the

massacres of Kishineff, was now Assistant-Minister of the Interior under Count Witte; that is to say, he held the title but not the powers formerly held by General Trepoff. The story of the discovery we take from his speech delivered to the Imperial Duma on June 21, 1906.

'In January 1906 one of the persons occupying a subordinate position in the Ministry . . . began to receive a large quantity of specimen appeals . . . and also anxious protests against the organising of massacres in Vilna, Byelostok, Kieff, Nikolayeff, Alexandrovsk, and other towns. . . . He used every means to avert any further massacres, which he also succeeded in doing. . . . At this time some light, though still of an imperfect nature, was thrown on the . . . work of the artificers of massacres. A group of persons, composing a kind of fighting organisation of one of our 'patriotic clubs,' together with some who were in close touch with the editors of a newspaper—not in St Petersburg—undertook to combat revolution. . . . The Russian population (of the frontiers), and in particular Russian soldiers, were invited to settle accounts with the traitors in tens of thousands of appeals with the most agitating contents. . . . There were strange results if one thinks of the preservation of the unity of authority. An Assistant Police-master (I merely give an example) circulates the appeals without the knowledge of his chief; . . . or again, a Police-captain, let us say, of the First Ward, was considered worthy of a confidence which was denied to the Police-captain of the Second Ward. Some one serving in the gendarmes' office, or in the Defence section, proved to be supplied with special sums of money. To him certain of the lower people began to resort. . . . Frightened inhabitants went to see the Governor. . . . Telegrams from the Ministry spoke of measures to be taken to secure tranquillity; and such measures were often taken. . . . In some cases the police quite honestly supposed that the measures were taken simply for show, for decency, but that they were already acquainted with the real intention of the Government; they read between the lines, and thought that they heard, beyond the order of the Governor, some voice from far-off in which they had greater belief. In a word . . . the authorities became completely demoralised.

'Meanwhile, in St Petersburg, so early as the autumn of 1905, and, it would seem, before the October Ministry came into office, in No. 16, Fontanka, in some remote room of the Police Department, a printing-press was at work; it had been purchased for the Department by Government money. This

press was put under the control of an officer of gendarmes in civil dress, one Comisároff, who, with a few assistants, assiduously prepared the appeals to which I have alluded. The secret of the existence of this "underground" press was so carefully kept, and the conduct of its organisers was so conspirative, that not only in the Ministry, but even in the Police Department, there were but few persons who knew about it. Meanwhile, the work of the Union of Patriots, whose organ the press was, was already meeting with success; for, when questioned by a person who happened to come upon the track of this organisation, Comisároff answered, "A massacre we can make for you, of any kind you please—if you like, for ten men; and, if you like, for 10,000." I may add that in Kieff a "massacre for 10,000" was arranged for February 20, but it was successfully prevented.

'The President of the Council of Ministers (Count Witte) had, we are told, a serious attack of nervous asthma when the facts I have just narrated were communicated to him. He summoned Comisároff, who reported to him on what he had done, and on the full powers which he had received. In a few hours the Department no longer contained either the press or the appeals or the staff; there was left only an empty room.'

Why did not Count Witte expose Comisároff? Who can estimate the value to the Government of a good Comisároff trial? But Count Witte knew that he could not take this line and retain his place. He did not dare to combat influences which were more powerful than his own. Mr Durnóvo, who, reactionary as he was, confessed to Prince Urúsoff that 'this was not his way,' was equally impotent. Comisároff, who had received a 'decoration,' was, as the writer was able to ascertain, quite recently living at large under an assumed name.

Prince Urúsoff resigned office to become the assailant of the policy of massacre as a member of the Imperial Duma. The ordinary bureaucratic comment on his speech was that 'Prince Urúsoff had betrayed Government secrets.' General Trepoff said, on July 9, to a representative of Reuter's agency, 'Il mentit, et c'est tout.' But the Prince did not speak at random. His speech was founded on intimate knowledge not only of the Government reports already quoted, but of other documents equally important.

The appeal of the 'Real Russians' to the Russian people, which was sold for a halfpenny in the office of the

'Novoe Vremya,' suggested that all trade should be interdicted to Jews; that all Jewish schools should be closed, and that Jews should be excluded from the secondary and higher schools; that all Jews who returned to Russia should be interned in the northern part of Siberia; that Jews should be debarred from work on all newspapers; and that all Jewish property should be sold within five years. This appeal was printed in the press of the City Prefect on March 4, 1906.

On Oct. 25, 1905, Mr Lavroff, who was at that time an official of the Ministry of the Interior, sent round a circular demanding a general union of 'all who love their country' against the Jews. An appeal freely circulated amongst the local troops before the Byelostok 'pogrom' runs as follows:

'A foreign enemy . . . has roused up the Jap against Russia. . . . On the quiet, across the seas and oceans, the foreign Tsars' (which means, of course, more particularly, King Edward and President Roosevelt) 'armed the enormous Japanese people against us. . . . Then arose our strength of Russia. . . . The foreign Tsars got scared; the hair bristled up on their heads; their skins crinkled with chill. And they thought of a mean idea—to undermine the heart of the Russian soldier, to shake his ancient Christian faith and his love for our Father Tsar. . . . They brought into the soldiers' ranks, almost wholly through Jews and hirelings, whole mountains of print, . . . and also heaps of gold, that they might buy base souls. . . . But our army turned away from these new Judases. . . . The foreign Tsars blushed. . . . There began in Russia an internal confusion. Again the fierce foreign foe sets his snares through his friends, always the Jews and the hirelings . . . that he may seize altogether the land of our fathers. But . . . he never put his own head in the way of our cannon, but bought, through the Jews, the souls of Russians—Christians. . . . Brothers, tread in the steps of Christ. Cry out with one voice, "Away with the Jewish kingdom! Down with the red flags! Down with the red Jewish freedom! . . . At the foe, Russian soldiers! Forward! forward! forward! They go! they go! they go!"'

The lesson, as we know in this case, was completed by the oral teaching of the officers. The appeal itself was printed by the Military Staff of Odessa. The 'Moscow Gazette' printed in heavily-led type an incitement to

violence against the Liberal, Mr Herzenstein, one of the most eminent members of the Duma. The result was that Mr Herzenstein was murdered by an ex-gendarme. Yet the 'Moscow Gazette' is one of the few papers with which the censorship never interferes. We may pause to note that, while foreign money alone stands between the Government and bankruptcy, while foreign loans maintain, in spite of the nation, the last remains of autocracy, official appeals accuse the British Government of financing the national movement for liberation. The situation is hardly dignified.

As to the circulation of the appeals by officials, we have further evidence in the Report of February 28, 1906, to the Minister of the Interior from the Director of the special section of the Police Department, Mr Makároff. In reply to an enquiry, he examined the papers of the special section for the Government of Ekaterínoslav. He found two reports, numbered 1054 and 1061, from Captain Budogóvsky, Assistant Chief Director of Gendarmes in the districts of Alexandrovsk and Pavlosk. They were dated November 27 and December 5, 1905. They 'left no doubt that massacres of Jews were being prepared, and that the criminal agitation to this end was made on the initiative of Captain Budogóvsky.' Adjoined to the reports were two printed appeals bearing the stamp of the 'People's party,' which identified the revolutionaries with the Jews; also six lithographed appeals, some of which are signed 'Union of Russians,' and one 'the Fighting Band of Russians in Alexandrovsk.' One of these appeals names and threatens members of the local Zemstvo; another insists that the revolutionary movement is exclusively conducted by Jews, and ends with the words: 'Down with them!' The appeal of the Fighting Band contains an incitement to massacre the revolutionaries and the Jews.

'Then rise, stand up, great People of Russia; form bands, get arms, scythes, and pitchforks. . . . At the first alarm meet with your arms in the square near the People's Palace and range yourselves with the Russian Fighting Band, which . . . with the portrait of the Tsar and with the Holy Ikon, will rush on our enemies, the men who carry red flags.'

Budogóvsky reports 'that these appeals are being diffused in great quantities; that they are of essential use;

that all the members of the Patriotic Union are known to him; and that he is employing all his influence for the circulation of similar appeals.' The special aide-de-camp, Pyatnitsky, writes Makároff, in forwarding the report to Mr Rachkóvsky, Director of the Political Section of the Police Department, and to Mr Timoféyeff, Director of the Special Section, added the note: 'The subjoined appeals contain absolute incitements against the Jews.' Neither Rachkóvsky nor Timoféyeff, who had become adjutant to General Trepoff, took any notice whatever. We also possess a copy of a dated and numbered circular from the Governor of Minsk, General Kurloff, to the local authorities, ordering them 'not to hinder the members of the Union of Real Russians from circulating amongst the population the ideas of this Union . . . which are put forward in the pamphlets and leaflets published by its Central Council.' On the other hand, one Andréyeff, who refused to print such appeals for the 'Journal of the City Prefect of St Petersburg,' was arrested and deported without trial to northern Russia.

If Prince Urúsoff had needed any further justification this would have been supplied by the 'pogrom' of June 14, 15, and 16, 1906, in Byelostok, which took place just before he delivered his speech. Though it was only later that the first accurate accounts began to come in, it is clear that the 'pogrom' almost exactly followed out the lines of the general plan of massacres as it was explained in the speech. Indeed one of the Commissioners of the Duma based his report on the outlines sketched by Prince Urúsoff. We do not give a detailed account of this 'pogrom,' because the final Government report is not yet before us; and, exhaustive as is the long report of the Commissioners of the Duma, their manner of taking evidence was not very satisfactory. We would rather convict the responsible persons by Government evidence. We will only notice the points more generally admitted. There were anarchists in Byelostok; in a few months there were forty-five cases of violence; some of the best of the police were murdered, including the Police-master Mr Derkacheff. This gentleman won the admiration of all; there are reasons to think that he fell a victim to the reactionaries. His successor, Mr Sheremétyeff, more than once threatened the Jews with a 'pogrom.'

Appeals were circulated. Some officers made provocative addresses to their men. The Governor was visited by some respectable Jews, and answered them roughly. It is uncertain who fired first; but there is evidence that provocative shots were fired by policemen. Many soldiers and policemen, including even officers, undoubtedly took part in attacking even defenceless Jews. The Governor took no measures at all. Repeated telegrams from Mr Stolýpin failed to stop the 'pogrom.' It stopped of itself on the day named by rumour in advance. Of the eighty-three victims, five were under the age of fifteen, including two children of ten, one of four, and one of two years of age. In this case there is no evidence of the complicity of St Petersburg. Mr Stolýpin removed the Vice-governor and reprimanded the Governor.

The responsibility of some local officials for the 'pogroms' was frankly admitted to the writer even by Mr Stolýpin. He recognised that, in the general disorganisation of the Government, some officials had taken independent political lines of their own. He himself, though unable to investigate every shot fired during the last year, had at least sent out a circular demanding from all officials the observance of the law. But we have now to deal with the responsibility of persons higher than the local officials.

'The explanation of the Minister of the Interior' (Mr Stolýpin) 'does not' (said Prince Urúsoff) 'give us any serious guarantee that an end will be put to these organisations. . . . The chief organisers and inspirers are outside the sphere of work of the Ministry. . . . No Ministry . . . will be able to establish order in the country while persons who stand apart, behind an impenetrable barrier, can lay rough hands on separate parts of the Government machine. . . . And yet, all the time, we all feel that those obscure forces are arming against us; that they hedge off the sovereign power from us, and undermine its confidence in us. . . . This danger will not vanish while the business of administration and the destinies of the country are under the influence of men who are by education quarter-masters and policemen, and by conviction organisers of massacre.'

Who were these 'obscure forces'? Public opinion names the late General Trepoff (who, as commandant,

controlled every avenue to the Palace of Peterhof), Count Ignátýeff, Prince Putyátin, Mr Mosóloff, and other officers in close touch with the Emperor. The Grand Duke Nikolai Nikolayévich, and to a less degree the Grand Duke Vladímir, are thought to be patrons of this group. Mr Rachkóvsky is clearly one of its official agents; General Bogdanóvich, a former police official, and Mr Dubróvin, are sedulous circulators of appeals. Admiral Dubásóff, General Kurloff, and Mr Neidhardt were the chief local executors of its ideas.

Prince Urúsoff confirmed to the writer the general outlines of this sketch and most of the details. General Trepoff was definitely the subject of his accusations; he was the instigator of the work of Comisároff and of Rachkóvsky, both of whom received rewards. There would have been no 'pogroms' but for the desire of such men as Kurloff and Kleigels to please the group. Both the gendarmes and the ordinary police were worn out by the political troubles, and would have been glad to see them come to an end.

We also obtained information from a gentleman who formerly held a high post in the Government, and was in a better position to inform us than any one else not directly implicated in the matter. He was anxious that the documentary evidence should be published, if only to show that not all Russian officials are guilty; that the policy of massacre is, in Russia as elsewhere, an illegal road; and that it is an exceptional development which could be stopped. Comisároff, he said, only began his special work under Trepoff. We asked, 'Were such men as Rachkóvsky more responsible than such men as Trepoff?' He answered, 'Surely the superior officer is more responsible than the man who carries out his ideas.' There was no doubt as to Trepoff's responsibility. 'But,' we said, 'he would hardly leave any proofs on the table.' 'Well,' he answered, 'he left more than you might think.' It cannot be said that he ordered a 'pogrom,' but one may feel convinced that he thought a 'pogrom' a good thing. As to Mr Stolýpin, he was a man of proved honesty and ability; but the full proofs had never been laid before him.

On Nov. 2, 1905, the Governor-general of Curland, General Bekmann, reported that he had received a tele-

gram from the Commander of Libau, describing how deputies from a large meeting, on the basis of the recent Manifesto, asked for the removal of martial law and the troops, and the liberation of political and administrative prisoners; the deputies promised in return the maintenance of order and a return to work. 'The Commander,' wrote Bekmann, 'recommends that martial law should be removed. I, too, think that martial law is not suitable to the new order of things.' He received the following answer: 'November 3. No 2952. I do not agree with your conclusions that martial law does not correspond with the new order of things. Instructions will follow. Assistant-Minister Trepoff.'

The Governor of Tula wrote on September 14, 1903, to General Trepoff asking whether he should allow the reactionaries to hold meetings and refuse leave to others, as the population 'might believe that the Government is carrying on an organised campaign with definite aims for the elections to the Imperial Duma.' General Trepoff replied: 'I do not share this view. The Government is bound to support its friends and not to encourage the enemies of the Government.' The article contains also a number of reports to General Trepoff from the local authorities, who explain how they have broken up the processions organised by their opponents, and how they have helped in the organisation of counter-demonstrations.* These are, perhaps, slight indications; but they make it clear that not only the officials but also General Trepoff took a side; and that neither the public, nor the police, nor the officials could be in any doubt as to what conduct would be most likely to please the Minister.

Such is the sketch which our materials allow us to make. The Jews lived under intolerable conditions; and we have abundant evidence of provocation from their side. Yet we cannot understand how policemen and soldiers were allowed to take sanguinary vengeance on whole masses of the population, in no way discriminating between innocent and guilty. Not only were these acts of vengeance allowed, but they were encouraged, and

* The text of the documents referred to in this and the foregoing paragraph was printed in the 'Rech' of May 9, in an article contributed by an official connected with the Police Department.

even organised, by certain high police-officers. And the general conduct of Trepoff, some of his written instructions, and his complete failure to punish such officers, make it clear that the actors were right in assuming that he, too, favoured a policy of violence and considered himself justified in using the authority and power of the Government against the majority of the nation. The Emperor, in promulgating the Manifesto of Oct. 30, had in principle sanctioned the claims of that majority. Yet this was the moment chosen by the apparently defeated group to construe any public meeting into an occasion for violent governmental suppression. In the case of Gomel, even this pretext was dispensed with; and the 'pogrom' began without it. The only link needed in the chain is supplied by the activity, the impunity, and even the rewarding of Comisároff. When the appeals reached the country, what doubt could either the police or their enemies have as to the real intentions of their rulers?

All the more emphatically must it be pointed out that the organisers of massacre were, from October 30 onwards, in no sense the authorised Government of the country. The actual Ministers were, in fact, the buffers between these persons and the people. Yet, if we can acquit them of blame, it is a sorry acquittal. Why did they hold office on such terms? And even the most conspicuously honest Minister, with a support from the Court which he is never likely to have, could not, by the exercise of a single will, uproot the evil which has spread so far. We have seen that the forces which represent what is called 'autocracy' have no longer the moral vigour requisite for the task. There is only one other solution. If the public sense has been mistaught by a long tradition of governmental violence, then there is all the more reason that the opposite process should be started at once. In principle Russia now possesses, in the Duma, the elements of public control; and that system must be set to work in practice if the demoralisation of the people is not to be indefinitely continued. The only Ministry which can deal with the 'pogroms' is a Ministry based on the national will.

INDEX

TO THE

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTH VOLUME OF THE QUARTERLY REVIEW.

[Titles of Articles are printed in heavier type. The names of authors of articles are printed in italics.]

A.

- Africa, South, histories of the war in, 143.
Agricultural labour, conditions of child-labour, 35.
Aldwinckle, Mr, quoted, 484.
Aldwyn, Lord St, chairman of the Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, 243.
Antarctic Exploration, Recent, 334—expeditions of Captain de Gerlache, *ib.*—Mr Borchgrevink, 334, 341—Captain R. F. Scott, 335, 340-356—Prof. Erich von Drygalski, 335, 337-340—Mr W. S. Bruce, 335-337—Dr Otto Nordenskjöld, 337—Dr Jean Charcot, *ib.*—the 'Gauss' expedition, 337-340—expedition of the 'Discovery,' 340-356—Ross Island, 342—Captain Scott's observations, 344 *et seq.*—the Ferrar glacier, 354.
Apostolical Succession, doctrine of the, 206.
Armitage, Mr, his expeditions, 340, 353.
Army, scheme for the reduction, 305.
Art, Modern British, and the Nation, 126—definition of the term, 127—tendency of 'realism,' 128—the 'end' and the 'means,' *ib.*—influence of environment on the artist, 129—portrait-painting, 130—decrease of subject-pictures, *ib.*—the 'golden period' of the seventies, 131—competition of photography, 132—abandonment of completeness and adoption of im-

pressionism, 133—neglect of beauty, *ib.*—want of design or composition, 134—Preraphaelitism, 135—the art of brush-work, *ib.*—difference in the two periods, 136—characteristics of buyers, *ib.*—necessity for art to be native, 138—French and Japanese art, 139—position of the modern artist and art-critic, 141—influence of public opinion, 142.

Art-work of Lady Dilke, The, 439. *See Dilke.*

Atkinson, Lord, criticism of the Devolution proposals, 507, 570.

Austin, A., character of 'The Garden that I Love,' 217-220—'Lamia's Winter Quarters,' 220—style, 227—optimism, 234, 240—ignorance of science, 239.

B.

- Baby-farming, practice of, 47-49.
Balfour, the Rt Hon. Gerald, his action about motor traffic, 514—his constructive policy in Ireland, 572, 573.
Bamborough, Castle of, 110, 115.
Barron, Mr O., 'Northamptonshire Families,' 533 *et seq.*
Bertrand and Reinach, Messrs, 'Les Celtes dans les vallées du Pô et du Danube,' 88.
Bigham, Captain Clive, on motor-car regulations in foreign countries, 522, 523.
Birrell, Rt Hon. A., M.P., his Education Bill, 293.

- Bodley, J. E. C., his essay on the 'Church in France,' 272, 274.
- Boer War, The First Year of the,** 143—histories of, *ib.*—character of the German book, 144—the 'Times History,' 145—political impartiality of the German authors, 147—criticisms on the deficiencies in the training of the British troops, 148—investment of Ladysmith, 149—battle of Elandslaagte, *ib.*—epithets applied to Sir G. White, 150—strategical distribution of troops, 151—battle of Colenso, 152—strictures on General Buller, *ib.*—causes of the defeat of Spion Kop, 153—methods of attack, 154—failure to pursue after the capture of Monte Cristo, 155—operations under Lord Methuen, 156—Modder River, 157—Magersfontein, *ib.*—courage of the Highland Brigade, 158—action of Stormberg, 159—Colesberg operations, 160—Lord Roberts' arrival, 161—his line of advance, *ib.*—moral effect of the charge at Klip Drift, 163—siege of Kimberley, *ib.*—Lord Kitchener's attack on Paardeberg, 163-166—action of Poplar Grove, 166—victory of Driefontein, *ib.*—criticism of the faults and failings of both sides, 167.
- Bonn, Dr Moritz, 'Modern Ireland and her Agrarian Problem,' 576, 581.
- Borchgrevink, Mr, his antarctic expedition, 334.
- Brandes, Dr, opinion of Ibsen as poet, 383.
- Brjand, A., 'La Séparation des Eglises et de l'Etat,' 272.
- British Art, Modern, and the Nation,** 126. *See Art.*
- British Museum (Natural History), The,** 491—its history, 491-493—trustees and officers, 491, 493, 505—its purpose and uses, 494-496—the duties involved, 496 *et seq.*—the need of trained experts, 497—of research, 498—how research could be fostered, 498, 499—a departmental staff, 500—qualities required in the keeper, 500-502—a governing body, 502—the State to share control, 503—the present system, 505-510—the public need, 510.
- Brown, P. Hume, 'John Knox,' 171, 175.
- Bruce, Dr J. C., his history of the Roman Wall in Northumberland, 106, 109.
- Bruce, Mr W. S., his antarctic expedition, 335.
- Buchanan's theory of glacial motion, 353.
- Burke's 'Landed Gentry' criticised, 557.
- Burns, the Rt Hon. John, his interest in the housing question, 490—his attitude towards motor-omnibuses, 530.
- Burrell, Mrs, her 'Life of Wagner,' 359.
- Bury, J. B., 'The Life of St Patrick,' 94.
- C.
- Campbell-Bannerman, Rt Hon. Sir H., M.P., character of his Cabinet, 287—on the two-Power standard, 322, 323—on the management of Irish affairs, 562.
- Carrington, Earl, as cottage-builder, 481, 487—his good work at the Board of Agriculture, 489.
- Chamberlain, Rt Hon. J., M.P., his scheme for education, 297.
- Charcot, Dr Jean, his antarctic expedition, 337.
- Children, The Cry of,** 29—number of legislative measures relating to children in the reign of Queen Victoria, 30, 33, 37, 46-48—employment of child-labour, 31—in factories, 32—in mines, *ib.*—chimney-sweeping, 33-35—agricultural labour, 35—brickfields, 36—treatment of juvenile offenders, *ib.*—reformatory system, 37—evils of street-hawking, 38—industrial school system, 38, 41—institution of a system of inspection, 39—tendency to evade parental duties, 40—methods for the reformation of the young, 41—result of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, 42-47—cases of child-suffering, 43—use of weapons, 44—number of cases, 45—practice of 'baby-farming,' 47-49—evils of infant life-insurance, 49-52.
- Chimney-sweeping, employment of children, 33.
- Church of England, its condition before the Oxford Movement, 196-202. *See Oxford.*
- Church, English, The Govern-**

ment of the, 242—report of the Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, *ib.*—classification of irregularities, 244–246—test applied to ritual practices, 247—three classes, *ib.*—deviations, 248—condemnation of practices, 249—use of vestments, 250—defects of the law, 251—objections to the Court of Final Appeal, 252—reforms recommended, *ib.*—conflicting elements in the Church, 254—the principle of the right of individual access to God, 255—hostility to the Church of Rome, 257—Acts of Uniformity, 259—position and rights of a national Church, 260—appeal to 'Catholic custom,' *ib.*—definition of the term, 261.

Church, R. W., 'The Oxford Movement,' 202.

Clausen, Mr, on the art of Japan, 139.

Clayton, John, his history of the Roman Wall in Northumberland, 106, 109.

Clough, Mr A. H., on cottage-building, 476, 479, 485–487.

Coats, Messrs J. and A., fit out an antarctic expedition, 336.

Commons, House of, relations with the House of Lords, 302—threats against, 304.

Corbett, J. S., 'England in the Mediterranean,' 2 *et seq.*—'The Fighting Instructions,' 14, *note*.

Cottage, The Cheap, 468—the demand for cottages, 469—borrowing facilities, *ib.*—Mr St Loe Strachey's opinion of cottage-building, 470, 472—reasons of expensiveness, 471—the Cheap Cottages Exhibition, 471 *et seq.*—details of cost and examples, 473–481—materials of the cottages, 481—question of durability, 482—temporary value of buildings, 483—necessity of taking trouble, 485—rate of interest on outlay, 487—cottages as security, 488—building bylaws in rural districts, 488–490—recent legislation, 489.

County Families, 531—Interest of the study of genealogy, 532—testimony of historians, *ib.*—heraldic fiction, 533—Mr Barron's book reviewed, 533 *et seq.*—'landed gentry' without land, 534—qualifications of thegnship, 535—Radical opposition to landowners, *ib.*—change in the hunting-field, 536—and in

the representation of counties, *ib.*—county gentlemen as members, 537—the era of Puritanism, 538–540—examples from Northamptonshire, 539—the Wakes, 541—Knights, 542—Spencers, 544—Ishams, 546—Langhams and Robinsons, 548—City aldermen as founders of landed houses, 549 *et seq.*—Cecils and Vanes, 550—FitzRois, 552—Drydens, 553—Burke's 'Landed Gentry' criticised, 557–560.

Cowan, H., 'John Knox,' 179, 192.

Cruelty to Children, National Society for the Prevention of, founded, 42—results disclosed, 43–45—number of cases dealt with, 46.

Cry of the Children, 29. *See* Children.

D.

D'Alton, Rev. E. A., 'History of Ireland,' 101.

Dannreuther, Mr, his volume on 'The Romantic Period of Music' criticised, 362–365.

Darwin, Major Leonard, 'Municipal Trade,' 438.

Davis, Mr, his hydrographical sketches, 342.

Day, Mr Justice, his condemnation of the system of infant life-insurance, 50.

Delcassé, M., 314.

Dilke, the Rt Hon. Sir Charles, his Memoir of Lady Dilke, 440 *et seq.*

Dilke, The Art-work of Lady, 439—the limited horizon of leading English feminine writers, *ib.*—Lady Dilke's wideness of interest, 440—her style, 441—as politician, *ib.*—efforts for women workers, 442—her art-work, 443—friendship with Mulready, *ib.*—with Watts, Millais, Ruskin, 444—marriage to Mark Pattison, *ib.*—journalistic work, 445—study of French art, 446—life at Oxford, 447–449—Taine's appreciation, 447—George Eliot's tribute, 449—work in art and politics, *ib.*—visit to Italy, 450—reputation in France, *ib.*—her second marriage, 451—friendships, *ib.*—her works reviewed, 452 *et seq.*—'The Renaissance of Art in France,' 452–456—'Art in the Modern State,' 456–461—'French Painters of the Eighteenth Century,' 461–464—her facility in

writing French, 462—'Architects and Sculptors,' 464, 465—'Furniture and Decoration,' 465—'Engravers and Draughtsmen,' 466—summary, 466, 467.

Drygalski, Prof. Erich von, his antarctic expedition, 335.

Dunlop, Robert, 'The Origins of the Irish Race,' 79.

Dunraven, Earl of, 564—his work for Devolution, 565.

Dunstanborough Castle, ruin of, 114.

Duse, Eleonora, as 'Hedda Gabler,' 390.

E.

Ecclesiastical Discipline, Report of the Commissioners on, 242. *See* Church.

Education Bill, 293.

Egotism, The Literature of, 215—character of 'The Garden that I Love,' 217—220—'Lamia's Winter Quarters,' 220—'The Solitary Summer,' 221—'The House of Quiet,' 223—'The Thread of Gold,' 224—'The Upton Letters,' *ib.*—'From December to December,' 225—similarities of style, 227—230—views on religion and morality, 230—235—significance of their attitudes, 235—traces of optimism, 236—pessimism, 237—ignorance of science, 239.

Election, General, in France, 263. *See* France.

Elliot, George, her tribute to Lady Dilke, 449.

'Elizabeth and Her German Garden,' 221—'The Solitary Summer,' *ib.*—her method of soliloquy, 222—style, 228—views on marriage, 232—religion, 233—optimism, 236.

England in the Mediterranean, 1—Mr Corbett's work on, 2—occupation of Tangier, 2, 16—18—first intervention, 3—Mansell's expedition, *ib.*—influence of the navy under the Commonwealth, 4—8—Self-denying Ordinance of 1645; 8—decline in efficiency in the reign of Charles II, 9—Mr Tanner's Introduction to the Pepysian Manuscripts, *ib.*—pensions granted to officers in time of peace, 10—establishment of the Royal Marines, 11—enforcement of discipline, 12—examination for lieutenants, *ib.*—average tonnage of ships, 13, *note*—want of funds, 14—selection

of a naval station, *ib.*—strategical importance of the Straits of Gibraltar, 15—sale of Dunkirk, 16—evacuation of Tangier, 18—20—despatch of the main fleet to the Mediterranean, by William III, 20—order to winter at Cadiz, 23—Spanish Succession War, 24—26—Marlborough's strategies, 26—capture of Gibraltar, 27.

Evans, Dr S., his translation of 'Geoffrey of Monmouth,' 62, *note*, 65.

F.

Factories, condition of child-labour in, 31.

Fisher, Sir John, his reforms at the Admiralty, 317, 327.

Fitzmaurice, Lord, 'Life of Lord Granville,' 302, 304.

France, The General Election in, 263—history of the Concordat, 264—the 'Organic Articles,' 265—Bill for the suppression of Congregational teaching, 266—President Loubet's visit to Rome, 267—relations with the Vatican, 267—269—organisation of the army secret service, 270—272—Mr Bodley's essay on the 'Church in France,' 272—Bill for the separation of Church and State, 272—274—the 'Associations Culturelles,' 274, 277—advantages of the law, 275—hardships, 276—M. Clemenceau's policy, 278—general election, 279—282—result, 282—stuffing ballot-boxes, 283—inconsistencies in voting, 285.

French art, character of, 139.

G.

Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Legend of Arthur, 54—his place in the 'House of Fame,' *ib.*—British 'History,' 55—influence of Arthurian romance, 56—on Shakespeare, 57—rejection by dramatists, 57—59—Tennyson's series of idylls, 60—popularity of Arthurian romance, *ib.*—causes for it, 61—Geoffrey's influence on the legend, 62—64—his personal history, 64—date of the composition, *ib.*—occasion and motive, 65—a 'national epos,' 66—the 'Prophecies of Merlin,' 67—his introductory chapter, 69—habit of recording contempo-

- aneous events in sacred and profane history, 70—fondness for topographical legends, 71—extracts of his style, 71-77—description of Arthur's coronation at Caerleon, 75—death of King Arthur, 77.
- Gerlache, Captain de, his antarctic expedition, 334.
- German account of the war in South Africa, 143—character of the book, 144 *et seq.*
- German Navy League, activity of, 309.
- Germany, system of education in, 298.
- Gibbon, E., on Geoffrey's influence on the rise of Arthurian romance, 61.
- Gibraltar, Straits of, strategic importance, 15—capture, 27.
- Gilbey, Sir Walter, as cottage-builder, 479.
- Goschen, Viscount, spirited action at the Admiralty, 309, 310—on the German naval policy, 320.
- Government of the English Church, The**, 242. *See Church.*
- Government, The, the Session, and the Education Bill**, 287—character of the Cabinet, 287-290—conduct of the Foreign Office, 289—the Colonial Office, *ib.*—result of divisions in the Cabinet, 290—Trades Disputes Bills, 290, 303—compensation for accidents Bill, 291—Land Tenure Bill, 292—Education Bill, 292-297—Mr Chamberlain's scheme, 297—plan in Germany, 298—position of the House of Lords, 300-302—relations with the House of Commons, 302—Bill for the abolition of plural voting, *ib.*—conspiracy to undermine the House of Lords, 304—Mr Haldane's scheme for the reduction of the army, 305.
- Grey, the Rt Hon. Sir Edward, his conduct of foreign affairs, 289—on Devolution, 563.
- Gurlitt, Professor, 'Geschichte der Kunst,' 83.

H.

- Hadow, Mr, 'The Oxford History of Music' criticised, 360-362.
- Haldane, Rt Hon. R. H., M.P., his scheme for the reduction of the army, 305.
- 'Hamburger Nachrichten,' the, quoted, 311.

- Hayman-Joyce, Mr J., details of his cottages, 479, 480.
- Healy, Dr, 'The Life and Writings of St Patrick,' 94.
- Henderson, Colonel G. F. R., 'The Science of War,' 148, 152, 167.
- Hodgson, John, his 'History of Northumberland,' 103.
- 'Home Counties,' 'The Cheap Cottage,' 468.
- 'House of Quiet,' and 'The Thread of Gold,' their character, 223, 224—style, 228—views on religion, 231—pessimism, 237.
- Hylton, Lord, and the Public Health Acts Bill, 489.

I.

- Ibsen, Henrik, 375—his creed a realisation of self, 376—influence on him of environment, 377—sense of the value of trifles, 378—hope for the future, 379—his conception of truth, 380—his own classification of his works, *ib.*—scientist and poet, 381—character of his verse, 382, 383—his notion of love, 384—'Brand,' *ib.*—'Peer Gynt,' 385—'The League of Youth,' 386—'Emperor and Galilean,' 387—'The Pillars of Society,' 388—'Ghosts,' *ib.*—'A Doll's House,' 389—'The Wild Duck,' *ib.*—'Rosmersholm' and 'The Lady of the Sea,' *ib.*—'Hedda Gabler,' 390—later plays, *ib.*—Maeterlinck's criticism, 391—effect on the drama, 392-394—his characters, 394, 395—rhythm and emotion, 396.
- Industrial school system, 38—inspection, 39.
- Infants, life-insurance of, evils of the system, 49-52.
- Insurance of infants' lives, evils of the system, 49-52.
- Ireland, The Real Needs of**, 561—a many-sided problem, *ib.*—the Devolution policy, 562-564—the Prime Minister's Stirling speech, *ib.*—ministerial statements, 563—Sir A. MacDonnell, 564—the Irish Reform Association, *ib.*—Lord Dunraven's efforts, 564—and scheme, 566, 567—the financial aspect, 568—Mr Dillon's view, *ib.*—devolution of parliamentary functions, 569—rumours of Government intentions, 570—enquiry into Mr Plunkett's department, 570-572—

rural congestion, 573-576—effects of the Land Act of 1903; 576—report of the Irish Estates Commissioners, 577—the Irish question, agricultural, 578—land purchase, *ib.*—peasant proprietorship, 579—reform of the peasant home-life, 580—effects of reform on emigration, 581—canals, *ib.*—education, 582—Dublin University, *ib.*—duty of the Opposition, 584.

Irish Race, The Origins of, 79—Dr Joyce's theory of 'arrested civilisation,' *ib.*—the six invasions, 81—evidence of a prehistoric race, 83—characteristics of the Iberian race, 84, 87—discovery of sculpturings on stones, 85—chain of ruined forts, 86—animals, 87—religion, *ib.*—the Celtic invasion, 88-92—union with Iberians, 90—trade, 92—introduction of Christianity, *ib.*—character of St Patrick's mission, 93-96—the golden period, 97—Gaulish origin of art, *ib.*—civilising influences, 98—Influence of the East, 99—Danish invasions, 100—'Island of the Saints,' 101—condition in the sixth to the ninth centuries, *ib.*

J.

Jackson, Captain H. S., 326.
Japanese art, character of, 139.
Jellicoe, Captain, director of Naval Ordnance, 318.
Joachim, Dr, Frau Schumann and, 368.
Jones, W. Lewis, 'Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Legend of Arthur,' 54.
Jowett, Prof., his criticism of art, 129.
Joyce, P. W., 'A Social History of Ancient Ireland,' 79.

K.

Kalbeck, Herr Max, 'Johannes Brahms,' 366.
Keble, John, on the spiritual nature of the Church, 203—on the doctrine of Apostolical Succession, 206.
Knox, John, and the Scottish Reformation, 169—works of David Laing, 170—Dr McCrie, 173—Prof. H. Brown, 175—relations between Queen Mary and Knox, 176—his

trial on a charge of treason, 178—Dr Cowan's book, 179, 192—character of Knox, 180—Mr Lang's book, 181—criticism of the 'History of the Reformation,' 183—destruction of monasteries, 184—accusations of falsehood against the Queen Regent, 185-187—his repetition of current slanders, 187—self-deception, 188—his views on the relations of Church and State, 189—Mr Mathieson's book, *ib.*—Mrs MacCunn's works on 'Knox' and 'Mary Stuart,' 191—humility of Knox, 193—his relations with his mother-in-law, *ib.*—last hours, 194.

L.

Laing, D., 'The Works of John Knox,' 170.
Lamb, C., on the condition of the child chimney-sweeper, 34.
Lang, A., 'John Knox and the Reformation,' 181, 183—'Mystery of Mary Stuart,' 192.
Leighton, Lord, on a national art, 140.
Literature, The, of Egotism, 215.
See Egotism.
Litzmann, Herr Bernhard, 'Clara Schumann,' 366, 367.
Lockroy, M., on shipbuilding in France, 313.
Long, the Rt Hon. Walter, on the speed-limit of motor-cars, 512—on Devolution, 564 *et seq.*
Lords, House of, difficulty of its position, 300—relations with the House of Commons, 302—conspiracy against, 304.
Loubet, President, result of his visit to Rome, 267.

M.

McCrie, Dr, his biography of John Knox, 171, 173.
MacCunn, F. A., 'John Knox,' 185, 191—'Mary Stuart,' 191.
MacDonnell, Sir A., his policy, 564.
McTaggart, J. Ellis, 'The Ethics of Henry Sidgwick,' 398.
Maeterlinck, M., on Ibsen as a dramatic poet, 391, 392.
Mahan, Captain, 319.
Mathieson, W. L., 'Politics and Re-

ligion from the Reformation to the Revolution,' 189.

May, Miss Florence, 'Life of Johannes Brahms,' 366.

May, Vice-Admiral Sir W., 322.

Mediterranean, England in the, 1. See England.

'Melisande,' 'From December to December,' 225—her gift for verse, *ib.*—for criticism, 226—style, 228—views of marriage, 232—of religion, 233, 241.

Mines, condition of child-labour in, 32.

Moore, Sir Arthur, 327.

Moore, Mr G. E., 'Principia Ethica,' 407.

Mossman, Mr, organises meteorological services in the S. Orkneys, 337.

Motor-cars, The Regulation of, 511—Mr Gurney's steam-carriage, *ib.*—the toll system, 512—the Act of 1896, *ib.*—the speed limit, 512, 522—526—the Act of 1903; 513, 514—motorists and the general election, 515—Report of the Royal Commission, 515—528—character of roads, 516—cost of their maintenance, 517, 527—question of taxation, 518—the dust nuisance, 519—521—the law and practice in foreign countries, 523—the motor-car as an agricultural produce carrier, 526—dangers to health in towns, 528—statistics of accidents, 529—no need for further legislation, *ib.*—the motor-omnibus, 530.

Municipal Socialism, 420—reaction from the Manchester school ideal, 421—society as developing, *ib.*—Mr Bernard Shaw and municipal trading, 422 *et seq.*—the connexion between Socialism and Progressivism, 423—the elimination of profits, *ib.*—topsy-turvy economics, 425—capital and credit, 426—London County Council steamboat service, 427, 431—change in land-values, 428—municipal capitalisation, 429—borrowing and indebtedness, 430—an application of socialistic principles, *ib.*—municipalism and the use of capital, 431—private enterprise discouraged, 432—effects of municipal monopoly, 433—State monopolies, 434—railways, *ib.*—where profits and losses go, 435—uses of municipal and State debts, 436—effects of the monopoly of electricity, *ib.*—Poplar and West

Ham extravagance, 437—the fanaticism of municipal monopolists, 438.

Müntz, Eugène, correspondence with Lady Dilke, 448, 450.

Music, The Romantic Element in, 357—division into 'Classical' and 'Romantic,' *ib.*—the formula, 358—revolutions in the art, 359—sonata and binary forms, 360—the 'two-subject' form, 361—use of it by Bach, Haydn, and Mozart, *ib.*—Brahms, 363, 364—Liszt, 364—music-colourists, *ib.*—critics' views of composers' motives, 365—367—Brahms and Frau Schumann, 366—369—Tchaikovsky's silent romance, 369—the present stage of musical art, 370—Bach a Romantic, 371—great composers not new form-makers, 372—need of a scientific definition, 373, 374.

N.

Nation, The, and Modern Art, 126. See Art.

Naval Situation, The, 307—a tendency to pessimism, *ib.*—the navy relatively stronger than ever, 308—condition of foreign navies, *ib.*—effect of the Spanish-American war, 309—Russian and German naval expenditure, *ib.*—Mr Goschen's reply, *ib.*—the Kaiser's activity, 309, 319—German Naval Act, 310—increase of expenditure by Britain, *ib.*—the situation in 1901; 311—subsequent improvement, 312—French view of their navy, 313—the *entente cordiale*, 314, 328—the Italian fleet, 314—our navy an engine of peace, 315—the rise of Japan, *ib.*—progress at the Board of Admiralty, 316—work of Sir John Fisher, 317—Sir Percy Scott, 318—Commander Robinson, *ib.*—and Captain Jellicoe, *ib.*—development of the German fleet, 319, 329—Lord Goschen's opinion of it, 320—the two-Power standard, 322—324—the Prime Minister's opinion, 322—and Lord Selborne's, *ib.*—illustration from last year's manœuvres, *ib.*—possibilities of changes abroad, 323—table of comparisons, 325—rates of shipbuilding, 326—the 'Dreadnought,' *ib.*—estimates of strength in 1910; 327—the alliance with Japan, 328—German energy, 329—332—need for an invincible British fleet, 333.

Navy, influence of the, under the Commonwealth, 4.

Newman, Cardinal, his theory of 'Development,' 211, 214—'On Romanism,' 211.

Newnes, Sir George, fits out an antarctic expedition, 334.

Niese, 'Keltische Wanderung,' 88.

Nordenskjöld, Dr Otto, his antarctic expedition, 337.

Northumberland, 103—John Hodgson's history, 103-106—character of the work, 104—committees formed to finish the work, 106—markings of the inscribed stones, 108—remains of the Roman Wall, 109—Castle of Bamborough, 110-112, 115—Norman conquest, 112—abbeys, *ib.*—raids of the Scots, 113—erection of 'peel-towers,' 113, 119—ruin of Dunstanborough, 114—Ainwick and Warkworth Castles, 116-118—county houses, 119—barbarous condition of the country, *ib.*—destruction from border-raids, 121—townships, 122—farmhouses, *ib.*—pit-village, 123—coal trade, *ib.*—characteristics, 124.

O.

Oppenheim, M., 'Administration of the Royal Navy,' 5, *note*.

'Oxford History of Music, The,' 360 *et seq.*

Oxford Movement, The Origin and Historical Basis of the, 196—condition of the Church before the Oxford movement, 196-200—the clergy, 200—influence of the Evangelicals, *ib.*—study of history, 201, 213—literature and arts, *ib.*—revival of the religious spirit, 202—views on the continuity of the Catholic Church, 203-206—doctrine of the Apostolical Succession, 206—Theological Society and Library of Fathers founded, 207—various Tracts, 208-211—doctrine of the 'Via Media,' 210—Pusey's 'Eirenicon,' 212—compared with modern ritualism, *ib.*

P.

Paladini, Captain Osvaldo, on the Italian navy, 314.

Pell, Mr Albert, on land-values, 428.

Photography, development of modern, 132.

Piccolomini, A. S., on the condition of Northumberland, 119.

Plunkett, Sir Horace, his Department of Agriculture, 570, 579—on the need of Ireland, 578.

Plural voting, Bill for the abolition of, 302.

Portrait-painting, ascendancy of, 130.

Potter, Mr Thomas, quoted, 484.

Preraphaelitism, view and influence of, 135.

Pusey, Dr., on 'What is Puseyism,' 205—on the tendency to Romanism, 211—his 'Eirenicon,' 212.

Pye, John, 'The Patronage of British Art,' 126.

R.

Rait, R. S., 'John Knox and the Scottish Reformation,' 169.

Real Needs of Ireland, The, 561. *See Ireland.*

Recent Antarctic Exploration, 334. *See Antarctic.*

Reformation, the Scottish, and John Knox, 169. *See Knox.*

Reformatory school system, 37—inspection, 39.

Reynolds, G. W. M., 'The Mysteries of London,' 32, *note*.

Rhys, Prof., 'Studies in Early Irish History,' 85, *note*, 89, 91.

Robinson, Commander C. N., on the gunnery of the fleet, 318.

Romantic Element in Music, The, 357. *See Music.*

Ross, Sir James, quoted, 343—his observations, 346 *et seq.*

Russian Government and the Massacres, The, 586—the irresponsibility of officials, 587—confessions of the Government, *ib.*—two opposing currents, *ib.*—position of the Jews, 588-590—Jewish revolutionaries, 590—Zubátoffs lectures, 591—a general strike organised, *ib.*—dualism within the Government, 592—Trepoff dictator, 593—officials demoralised, *ib.*—the pogrom as a weapon, 594—Jewish activities, 595—retaliation in Kieff, 596—description of a pogrom, 596-599—the pogrom in Odessa, 600-602—disorders in Kharkoff, 602—Revel and Minsk, 603—a pause in the

bloodshed, *ib.*—pogrom at Gomel, 604–608—Jewish revolutionary militia, *ib.*—bureaucratic impotence, 608—appeals for union against the Jews, 609, 610—pogrom in Byelostok, 611—the head of the offending, 613, 614—the guilt of underlings not of Ministers, 615.

S.

Sabatier, P., on a new Catholicism, 286.
 ‘Schlesische Volkszeitung,’ quoted, 321.
 Schools, reformatory and industrial systems, 37, 38—inspection, 39.
 Schweitzer, M. Albert, ‘J. S. Bach,’ 370.
 Scott, Captain R. F., his antarctic expedition, 335.
 Scott, Rear-Admiral Sir Percy, and the gunnery of the navy, 318.
 Scott, Sir W., on the art of painting, 140.
 Shaftesbury, Lord, his Factory Act of 1844; 32—other Acts, 35, 36.
 Shaw, Mr Bernard, on municipal trading, 422 *et seq.*
 Shirley, Mr, ‘The Noble and Gentle Men of England,’ 533.
 Siculus, D., on the union of Celts and Iberians, 90.
 Sidgwick, The Ethics of Henry, 398—epitome of his career, 398, 399—as a teacher, 399—university reformer and politician, 400—his chief interest religion, *ib.*—attitude towards Christianity, 401—psychical research, 402, 418—his books, *ib.*—his treatment of ethics, 403—not a psychological hedonist, 404—an intuitionist, 406—the principles of prudence and of national benevolence, 408—an ethical hedonist, 409–412—universalistic 410—his fifth intuition the maxim of prudence, 413—an alternative principle, 414—benevolence and happiness, *ib.*—reward for morality in life, 415—the problems of religion, 416—metaphysical means of arriving at a belief in God, 416–418—his conclusion, 419.
 Soares, Mr, M.P., introduces a Motor Bill, 515.
 Spalding, T. A., ‘Life and Times of Richard Badley,’ 15, *note*.

Strachey, Mr J. St Loe, on cottage-building, 469, 470.
 Street-kwking, evils of the system, 38.
 Strzygowski, Prof., extracts from his books, 94, 99.
 Symons, Arthur, ‘Henrik Ibsen,’ 375.

T.

Taine, M., at Oxford, 447.
 Tanner, J. R., his Introduction to the Pepysian Manuscripts, 9 *et seq.*
 Tchaikovsky, Herr Modeste, ‘Life and Letters of Peter Illich Tchaikovsky,’ 369.
 Tennyson, Lord, his idylls of King Arthur, 59.
 Thomson, M., the French Minister of Marine, 314.
 ‘Times History of the War in South Africa,’ 143—character and style of the book, 145 *et seq.*
 ‘Times, Tracts for the,’ 202. *See* Tracts.
 Tractarian Oxford Movement, 196. *See* Oxford.
 ‘Tracts for the Times,’ 208–211—extract from the preface, 202.
 Trades Disputes Bills, 290, 303.
 Troup, Mr, on cottage-building, 482, 483.

U.

‘Upton Letters, The,’ 224—style, 228—views on religion, 231—pessimism, 237—criticism of science, 239.

V.

Victoria, Queen, holds a children’s review in Dublin, 29—legislative measures in her reign for the reform in the condition of children, 30, 33, 37, 46–48.

W.

Wallace, William, neglect of his anniversary, 169.

Ward, W. G., 'Ideal of a Christian Church,' 205.

Warkworth Castle, 116.

Watts, Sir Philip, 326.

Waugh, Rev. B., founds the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, 42—his paper 'On Some Conditions of Child Life in England,' 44.

Wells, Mr A. Randall, prize-winner

at the Cheap Cottages Exhibition, 476.

White, Sir William, 326.

Wilhelm, Kaiser, and the German navy, 309, 319.

Wilson, Admiral Sir Arthur, 322, 323, 327.

Woodman, W., his help in writing the 'History of Northumberland,' 107.

END OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTH VOLUME.

✓
o1
o
et
pC
sC
t
a4
sl
ca

7

1

2

41